

to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact remedial legislation to provide members of the armed forces with wage credits on their social-security accounts for the period of their military service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3441. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Master Sgt. Gerhard Neumann; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 3442. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Kyle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3443. A bill for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3444. A bill to grant the title of public lands to the town of Safford, Ariz., for the use of its municipal water system; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 3445. A bill for the relief of Thelma Eileen Lovell Dean; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

927. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution by the Assembly of the State of New York, urging enactment of legislation declaring the Indians within the State of New York, whether residing within or without any of the reservations within such State, subject to the jurisdiction and laws of the State of New York in all respects excepting only those matters wherein jurisdiction has been or hereafter shall be expressly assumed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

928. By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri: Resolution of the Nevada, Mo., Chamber of Commerce in support of House bill 2536; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

929. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Paterson division, American Palestine Committee, urging the enactment of House Joint Resolution 198 for the reconstitution of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

930. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Jack Pessina and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

931. Also, petition of Hy L. Schnellmann and 29 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

932. Also, petition of Andrew Johnson and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legis-

lation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

933. Also, petition of William H. Martin and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

934. Also, petition of William Potthast and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

935. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition of William Hutchinson and 263 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of legislation enabling the tenants and occupants of Delmo Labor Homes to purchase these homes on long terms at low interest rates, so that these Missourians will not be evicted and rendered homeless under the farm-security program, now pending, to liquidate this project by sale to the highest bidder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

936. Also, petition of Iona Ayers and 113 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of legislation enabling the tenants and occupants of Delmo Labor Homes to purchase these homes on long terms at low interest rates, so that these Missourians will not be evicted and rendered homeless under the farm-security program, now pending, to liquidate this project by sale to the highest bidder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

937. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. G. Jordan and various citizens of the parish of Caddo, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, June 4, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, unto the hills of Thy grace and glory we lift the expectant eyes of our faith, for from Thee cometh our help. Even as with bending backs we toil in the valley, we are grateful that the light of heaven falls upon our daily path, and that in the beauty of common things we may partake of the holy sacrament of Thy presence.

In these days when searing hate has done its worst on the earth, we thank Thee for men and women of good will under all skies, the saving salt of a tortured world, upon whose integrity of character and whose understanding sympathy with other nations and races the hopes of tomorrow's world rest. Keep strong everywhere all souls who strive to maintain the insights of human brotherhood. In this Capital City set upon a hill, may we be ministers of an abiding peace, true servants of the common good, and forerunners of Thy kingdom's coming. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 11, 1945, was

dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ARTHUR A. KOSCINSKI TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, notice is hereby given that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 20, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, Capitol Building, upon the nomination of Arthur A. Koscinski, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Arthur J. Tuttle, deceased. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the chairman; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]; and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

TRIBUTE TO HON. RALPH A. BARD

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it has just recently been announced that the resignation of Mr. Ralph A. Bard, Under Secretary of the Navy, has been accepted, effective on July 1, 1945.

Mr. Bard has served as Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary for a period of about 4½ years. He was responsible for the supervision and direction of the Naval Shore Establishment and all matters relating to civilian personnel. During his tenure of office the civilian personnel of the Navy increased from approximately 90,000 employees to over 700,000. The Navy has grown from 383 combatant ships to over 1,300 combatant ships, plus a new-born armada of over 58,000 landing craft, not to mention over 6,000 smaller vessels and 40,000 aircraft.

The excellent production record made by the Navy was due in large measure to the efficient manner in which Mr. Bard performed his duties.

The Members of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee have come to know Mr. Bard very well and have found him to be an able administrator. They regret that he has found it necessary to leave the position of Under Secretary of the Navy and hope that after taking a much needed rest it will be possible for him to return to Government service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service from the period April 1 to May 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the administrative officer of the White House and the vice president of

the Panama Railroad Company, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending September 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

JURISDICTION OVER WATERWAY, RIVER, AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE COMMON COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from the city clerk of Milwaukee, Wis., a certified copy of a resolution relating to the retention of jurisdiction over waterway, river, and harbor improvements in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has for more than a century vested in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, jurisdiction over the improvement of waterways, rivers and harbors, flood control, and allied matters; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has carried out these responsibilities with great fidelity to the public interest and with unsurpassed technical ability, and it is manifest to all concerned with our national commerce and transportation and familiar with the requirements of navigation and shipping that these activities should be continued under the same jurisdiction and the same high standards now in effect: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to retain jurisdiction over waterway, river, and harbor improvements in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, which has ably and impartially met this responsibility for more than a century, with the highest standards of efficiency and economy, and with high regard for the public interest; and that said council hereby goes on record as opposed to the transfer of these duties and functions of the Corps of Engineers to any other agency of Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 2754. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State-court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 362).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1138. A bill to amend title III, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1139. A bill for the relief of the residents of Guam through the settlement of meritorious claims; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1140. A bill to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. L. 984), and the act of June 15, 1935, supplementary thereto (49 Stat. L. 378), and the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. L. 1250), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the production of petroleum for the national defense from Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

RELEASE OF MEDICAL PERSONNEL FROM ARMED FORCES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 134), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the relative needs of the armed forces and the civilian population for the services of medical personnel with a view to ascertaining (1) whether, as a result of developments in the war, or through more efficient utilization of medical personnel, such personnel can be released from the armed forces for civilian service without impairment of the war effort; (2) the speed with which demobilization of medical personnel in the armed forces can be accomplished as the needs of the armed forces diminish, and (3) whether any further action is necessary to insure an adequate supply of trained medical personnel to meet the future needs of the armed forces and the civilian population of the Nation. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF SHORTAGE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make an investigation of the existing newsprint shortage.

As every Senator knows, Mr. President, the patriotic publishers of this Nation have given literally millions of dollars' worth of free advertising to the Treasury for the various war loan drives. They have contributed much news space not only to the sale of war bonds, but to the Office of Price Administration program

to hold down prices, to the War Production Board to aid in the gathering of needed materials and in the conservation of others.

It would be difficult for me, in a few minutes, Mr. President, to recite the over-all war contributions of the newspapers of America. And we all know that their contribution has been great, and that their contribution will continue, no matter what the Government does or does not do.

For some time I have been cognizant of the difficulties of newspapers in obtaining an adequate supply of newsprint, but as long as the war in Europe raged, neither the publishers nor any Senator wanted to take action that seemed to overlook the exigencies of the period. Now, however, the war in Europe is over—has been over more than a month—and it would seem that the patriotic newspaper publishers of America could look for a respite in the newsprint shortage.

But even a preliminary investigation will reveal that this is not the case. Actually, the publishers must look forward to greater shortages, unless quick action is taken now by each Government agency charged with one or the other of the factors affecting newsprint production or distribution.

Just the other day, on June 7, one of the largest newspapers in Nebraska, the Omaha World-Herald, stated in an editorial that the United States Government's purchases of paper for all purposes increased from 124,500 tons in 1941 to 1,064,512 tons in 1944, attributing its information to the War Production Board.

Think of it—the Government's use of paper has increased eight and one-half times in a 4-year interval, while private publishers were suffering more and greater reduction. More than a year ago, Augustus E. Giegengack, the Public Printer, admitted to a subcommittee of the House of Representatives, that he did not know of all the paper being used by Uncle Sam, because much Government printing was being done outside the Government Printing Office, exclusive of that done by the armed services.

I have discussed this matter with other Senators on both sides of the aisle, and I am convinced that a careful investigation by the Senate will not only uncover abuses in the use of paper by the Government, bungling on the part of those who have charge of allocating newsprint, and slow action by the agencies connected with planning to relieve the shortage in this Nation, but, more important than these revelations, I believe such an investigation would work positively toward increasing the flow of newsprint to our hard-pressed publishers.

On May 31 last, my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] placed in the RECORD, at page 5334, a seven-point plan suggested to him by an Indianapolis, Ind., newspaper publisher, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam. That seven-point plan has been the subject of wide study both by other Senators and by the industry, I know, and I am anxious that the various bureaus which have anything at all to do with newsprint production or

distribution see it and, even more appropriately, act on it.

I have checked closely enough into this situation to know that the bureaus in charge are mindful of the situation, but that they should be spurred into more decisive action. There is absolutely no good reason why the newspaper publishers of this country cannot be given some relief from this problem, which is serious to them, in the next several months. Prompt action will bring that relief, and I believe that the Senate should see to it that prompt action is forthcoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska (for himself and Mr. WILLIS) will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the causes of the existing shortage of newsprint, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations as to any legislation necessary to provide for relieving such shortage.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT UNIVERSITY OF UTAH BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at the seventy-sixth annual commencement of the University of Utah at Salt Lake City, Utah, June 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES AS A MEDIATOR FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject United States as a Mediator for Peace delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Manhattan (Kans.) Rotary Club, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAMING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous notice given by him, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is recognized.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Finance I re-

ported a few days ago Senate bill 880 to provide for naming the veterans' hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The Senator from Ohio has kindly yielded to me so that I may call up that bill at this time. I move that Senate bill 880 be now taken up for immediate consideration.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with the understanding that the Senate will revert to the regular order, there is no objection on my part.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 880) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as the Royal C. Johnson Veterans' Hospital.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I introduced the bill some time ago. The Senate Finance Committee has unanimously approved the bill, and it is now on the calendar. The Budget Bureau has also approved it. I desire to say merely a brief word in connection with the bill.

Royal C. Johnson was for more than 15 years a Member of the House of Representatives from my State. Most of the Senators on this floor knew Mr. Johnson. He was chairman of the Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives from the time of its beginning until he left the Congress. I desire, and the people of my State will be much honored, to have the new veterans' hospital in that State at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., named the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Hospital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Royal C. Johnson Veterans' Hospital.

COMPENSATION OF POSTAL WORKERS—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have here some editorials which were gathered together by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, who has shown great zeal in behalf of the bill which is now pending before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads dealing with postal pay. These editorials are from every part of the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert them in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Scranton Times of March 21, 1945]

POSTAL WORKERS SEEK INCREASE

Postal workers are looking for a rise in pay. They have been looking for one, in fact, for a long, long while. It was back under President Coolidge that the maximum salary was increased from \$1,800 to \$2,100 annually.

Something over a year ago a temporary bonus of \$300 was allowed postal workers. This expires June 30 unless Congress extends it or there is a substitute bill passed which will make the increase permanent. That's what the postal workers want. They are asking that the Burch bill, which would give an immediate increase of \$400 a year, overtime based on a 40-hour week, and an opportunity for postal workers in large cities to be upgraded to \$3,000 a year and those in smaller cities to \$2,700 a year over a period of years, be passed. Representative BURCH is chairman of the House Post Office Committee. The fact that he has sponsored the bill may be taken as an indication of belief by committee members that the demands of postal workers are reasonable and should be granted.

Postal workers have been trying for a number of years to get a pay increase commensurate with their work, responsibility, and to help them meet the increased cost of living. In the last Congress a bill was passed by the House and was ready to go through on final reading in the Senate, but became lost in the shuffle or was shoved aside to permit action on what the Senators thought was more important legislation.

Postal service, next to the courts, is the oldest public service in the country. No Government activity comes closer to the people.

Postal workers are asking friends to urge on Members of Congress prompt and affirmative action on their demand for a pay increase to help them meet the cost of living.

[From the Boston Post]

RAISE WELL EARNED

The Post Office Department has turned over to the Treasury a \$47,000,000 check, which represents a surplus in receipts over expenses from July 1, 1943, through September 1944. During the current fiscal year there's every reason to believe that even that fat surplus will be surpassed and by a big margin.

Of course, for a governmental branch traditionally saddled with a deficit that's a remarkable showing—a showing made possible by the war. It reflects, too, a terrific increase in business by thousands of efficient postal workers, who have been demonstrating for a long time their right to an increase in pay.

[From the Scranton Tribune of April 24, 1945]

POSTAL WORKERS MERIT PAY BOOST

It was a regrettable development that the last session of Congress expired without the lawmakers doing justice to the Nation's postal workers who are seeking a well-earned increase in salary schedules. The measure passed the House but got caught in the last-minute jam in the Senate.

The issue is again before Congress and there is no excuse for it falling by the wayside this time. The postal worker's case is a meritorious one; he is a tried, faithful, and efficient worker; he, like all others, is confronted with higher living costs, yet he hasn't had a salary boost in 20 years.

It is up to the public, which benefits first hand from the efficiency of the postal department, to let the Members of Congress

know the people want the postal workers to get their just dues. Congressman MURPHY is solidly in favor of the measure. Residents of other districts would do well to ascertain the views of their Representatives and write them urging support of the bill, which is designated H. R. 2071. The time is long overdue for the country to deal fairly with its postal employees.

[From the New York Journal-American of December 26, 1944]

POSTAL WORKERS LOSE AGAIN

The legislative log-jam at the close of the Seventy-eighth Congress prevented action by the Senate on a measure providing pay increases for postal employees, and thus prolonged the Federal policy of injustice against these vital Government workers.

This is an unmitigated betrayal of the most grievously and inexcusably underpaid group of workers in the United States.

The thousands of postal workers who would have been the beneficiaries of this measure have not had an increase in basic pay for nearly 20 years.

They actually work overtime at a lower rate of pay than that applying to regular time.

Congress had every moral reason to pass this bill.

It had plenty of time to pass it. The House of Representatives, in fact, did pass it in ample time.

But the Senate, to its shame, simply did not get around to it until the final hour of the closing session—and then found itself lacking a quorum.

This is a bitter experience for America's postal workers, but an all too familiar experience.

It is a particularly bitter disappointment for their families at Christmas time, and the Members of Congress responsible for it are guilty of a shameful act of negligence and discrimination.

The next Congress, convening in January, should make it the first order of business to put an end to the prolonged disappointments and discouragements of the Nation's postal workers.

It is little short of a national crime that these essential, overworked, and underpaid employees of the Federal Government should continue to be victims of congressional negligence and discrimination, and the new Congress should deal with their cause according to its obvious and acknowledged merits.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of March 31, 1945]

BE JUST TO THE MAILMAN

In thousands of communities and rural areas, the mail carrier is one of the most familiar figures.

Throughout the years, in all kinds of weather—to paraphrase the famous line from Herodotus which is the motto of the postal service—he goes his "appointed rounds."

Nowadays, when millions of men and boys are away from home with the colors, his visits may be as comforting to anxious households as those of the family doctor.

And in these war years his task has been as endless and his burdens often have been heavier than in the times of peace.

For the postal service has had to break all records in the volume of mail delivered, and it has had to do this with the most serious manpower shortage the Department has ever known, so that every employee in the postal service has had to work harder than ever before.

Moreover, these men have received no extra pay for the extra and even extraordinary service that they are giving.

Their salaries are fixed by law and, because the law is obsolete, the salaries are grossly unfair and inadequate—which is doubly unjust since at this very time the

monetary receipts of the Post Office Department are the highest in its history.

This inequity will be corrected if Congress passes the Burch bill which is now under consideration.

The bill will make a complete reclassification of postal employees, the first in 20 years; it will grant an immediate increase of \$400 in the annual basic pay, with honest overtime of time and a half for more than 40 hours of work a week; and it will provide for annual increases over a limited term of years as an incentive to keep men in the service.

In an appearance before the Post Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, warned Congress that the future of the postal service will be determined by its action on the Burch bill.

Speaking hopefully for the letter carriers, he said:

"It would appear that at long last the carrier will be given an equal opportunity with his fellow American to share in a decent standard of living."

The country can well afford this act of justice, which has been too long withheld.

The mail carrier and the postal clerk are essential workers, in war or in peace.

They should be respected and rewarded as such.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of April 30, 1945]

REASONS SO STRONG

The Burch bill to give the postal employees a permanent wage increase is a much better measure than the one which died in the Senate last December after passing the House with a single dissenting vote.

The reason for passing the bill are so strong that it is difficult to see how any serious opposition to it can develop.

As unanimously reported to the House by the Post Office Committee, the Burch bill provides for a \$400 increase in the wages of each employee, time and a half for overtime instead of the present straight-time basis, the reclassification, including extensive upgrading, of employees, and the provision of longevity increases of pay over an 11-year period instead of the present 5-year period.

There has not been a reclassification of jobs since the general act of 1925 nor an increase in pay except for a temporary \$300 annual increase since the start of the war under a law which will expire June 30.

The postal service provides the most frequent and perhaps the most favorable contracts between the average citizen and his National Government. The mails have always gone through, come rain or storm or cold. Chosen on the basis of merit, the carriers and their fellow employees have never forgotten to be faithful and courteous in serving their employers, the great public. They therefore deserve from the public generous support for the Burch bill because they merit on the basis of performance all the benefits provided under the proposed measure.

[From the Nashville Banner of May 2, 1945]

POSTAL EMPLOYEES, THE REAL FORGOTTEN MEN

The Banner has said before that no group within the Federal employee structure commands more respect—as a group—than the postal employees. Day in and day out, year in and year out, they render efficient service. As a unit, they represent the antithesis of the bureaucracy which, in so many departments and agencies, has come to predominate. No higher compliment could be paid them than the one which speaks for itself in that comparison.

Consider then the injustice connoted in the fact that postal employees have had no raise

in 20 years. Their last salary increase was in 1925. Even during the economic ordeal of the present war emergency, when means were found to put through raises for almost everyone in the country—in Government service and out of Government service—postal employees have been the forgotten men.

Now pending in the House Post Office Committee is H. R. 3035—a bill providing for a general reclassification and salary increase for these employees. It should be passed at once. Congress must not prolong the situation of this injustice. The bill should be adopted, and its provisions put into effect at the earliest possible date.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin of March 20, 1945]

POSTAL WORKERS' PAY

To be reported from committee to the House in Washington within the next week or two is a bill which would make permanent the temporary \$400-a-year wage increase granted some months ago to post-office employees as a cost-of-living bonus.

Congress has ample justification for enactment of this measure. Postal employees have been without an increase in basic pay since 1925, and few wage rates anywhere in the country are on such a basis. Postal work has multiplied and personnel has been reduced by the war. Overtime rates are less per hour than regular pay.

The measure being prepared would grant to per diem employees a percentage increase comparable to the flat raise planned for workers on an annual salary. A similar measure was caught in the legislative jam at the end of the last session and failed.

The situation has not changed since the cost-of-living bonus was granted. None of the arguments about holding the wage line applies in this case, for if Congress fails to act by June 30, the effect will be that of a wage cut.

[From the Youngstown Vindicator of May 22, 1945]

POSTAL WORKERS' PAY

The House has voted, 360 to 1, to raise postal employees' basic salaries by about \$400 a year. The Senate should follow the example promptly for two reasons: The increase is long-delayed justice; it is needed to keep the postal service efficient.

There has been no change in basic postal salaries since 1925. For the last 2 years the employees have been given a temporary \$300 bonus. But since the old base was kept they got less pay for their overtime than for straight time. The bill passed by the House will set up a new base, and allow time and a half for overtime as in private employment.

Under the existing pay system the Post Office Department finds it virtually impossible to recruit new workers. Thousands of workers have been forced to go into other employment in order to support their families properly. As President William C. Doherty, of the National Association of Letter Carriers, wrote recently, this situation raises "a grave danger—the development of an inferior postal system." So Congress will be serving the public interest as well as simple justice if it completes passage of the postal increase without delay.

[From the Kansas City Jewish Chronicle of April 13, 1945]

POSTAL EMPLOYEES ASK FOR A RAISE—FIRST THEY WILL HAVE HAD IN 20 YEARS

Postal employees are asking for an annual increase of \$400 in earnings, the first they will have had in 20 years. A \$300 bonus is now in effect until June 30 of this year, but this raise was nullified by the passage of the withholding-tax law passed at the same time. Increased earnings at the present time are

due to overtime work, which is paid for at a lower rate than for regular employment.

During the depression years pay cuts and payless furloughs were no exception and were put into effect without delay.

The Post Office is handling the largest volume of mail in its history. Since 1935 the volume of business has increased 65 percent, with an increase of only 36 percent in personnel. Thousands of its younger workers, with over 10,000 mail carriers, are in the armed forces.

There are not many mechanical improvements in the post office as it is largely a job of individually handling each piece of mail several times. Over 100,000,000 pieces of mail are delivered daily.

The salary bill, H. R. 2071, is now in the hands of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee of Congress. Those in favor of its passage may write to their Senators and Congressmen urging them to vote for it.

[From the Denver Catholic Register of April 12, 1945]

POSTMAN'S FUZZLE DEMANDS SOLUTION (By Rev. Maurice E. Reardon)

The most eagerly expected public servant in the daily life of Americans, today more than ever, is the man in the slate-blue uniform with the brown leather sack on his back and elastic in his legs—the letter carrier. He is the good-natured fellow who cajoles the neighborhood mongrels, pals with the kids on his route, cheerfully bears with the fickleness of the weatherman, shares in the community's joys and sorrows, and seldom asks for any personal favors. It is easy to take such loyal service for granted. It should be hard for any patron to ignore the postman's plea for assistance in solving a serious problem that faces him.

The situation is simply this: Your letter carrier and the other postal employees have not had a raise in their basic pay since 1925, a quarter of a century ago. During the lean years of 1929 to 1934 postmen took a 27 percent cut in pay. A war bonus of \$300 per year granted by Congress is to expire automatically July 1. Now in the past 4 years alone the cost of living has risen more than 40 percent. Simple mathematics poses the problem: How are the slighted men and women of the postal service going to make the grade? Give up? Well, do not, because there is something you can do to help out these people to whom we are all indebted.

Last autumn patrons of the postal service all over the country wrote to their Senators and Congressmen urging that a measure providing for adjustment of the salaries of letter carriers and other post-office workers be adopted. So widespread and effective was the appeal that the bill was passed by the House of Representatives with but one dissenting vote. In the Senate, however, the bill became involved in the last-minute legislative jam and the session adjourned without the measure being permitted to come to a vote.

In the present session of Congress a new measure, H. R. 2071, providing for the long-delayed financial relief of postal workers, has been introduced by their friends. Accordingly these men and women are asking their patrons again to write their Congressmen and to urge adoption of the measure, which is designed to provide the needed adjustment in pay.

Realizing the importance of their services, these men have stood by their routes to give you the full benefit of good service, even though higher living costs have outstripped their pay and war industries have tempted them with wartime salaries. From the ranks of Denver's postal employees 225 have entered the armed forces. Receipts of the Denver post office for the past year reached an all-time high with an income of more than five and one-half million dollars.

During the past 15 years postal employees helped to organize and distribute for the NRA, the soldier bonus bonds, unemployment census, alien registration, war-bond drives, and many other projects, all without extra compensation or additional burden upon the taxpayer.

It is not often that your postman comes to you with his problems, but he does so now, because you are the one who can correct an impossible economic situation and get for him a salary adjustment that will make it possible for him to continue to serve you and sustain himself and his family. You can do this by immediately writing to your Senator and to the Congressman representing your district. Do it now before the mailman slips the next letter into your box. If you do, you will then be able to face him with a sincere smile and feel that you have repaid his efforts in a small way.

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Labor Bulletin of May 25, 1945]

AN APPEAL FROM YOUR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

DEAR FRIEND: Will you please help us?

Last fall we asked for an increase in pay. We did not receive this increase. On the final day of the last session of Congress a technicality, raised by a Senator, caused the pay increase bill to be pigeon-holed. Now we are forced to start all over again. During the present emergency we are receiving a temporary bonus of \$5.76 a week. This bonus expires June 30. We are trying to get a raise of \$7.69 a week to replace this bonus. This would be an increase of \$1.93 over the present bonus.

Do you know that the postal employees have not received an increase in pay since 1925? (over 20 years ago).

Do you know that 5 percent of our salary is deducted to pay toward our retirement?

Do you know that the raise in postal rates did not in any way benefit the postal employees?

Do you know that postal employees are paid from postal receipts and not from general taxes?

Do you know that the Post Office Department turned over \$40,000,000 on October 1, 1944, to the Treasury?

Do you know that more than 50,000 postal employees are in the armed forces?

Do you know that the postal employees receive less per hour for overtime than for regular time?

Do you know that it takes the unified support of Congress to give us an increase in salary?

Do you know that we need your help right now? You will render us a great service by writing to your Congressman and Senators to support the reclassification bill for postal employees, H. R. 2071. Remember—the only recourse we have is to get your support. Won't you please help us by writing these letters. Hand them to your postman and if necessary we will pay the postage.

Thank you,

YOUR POSTAL EMPLOYEE.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., of April 5, 1945]

YOUR POSTMAN

(By Lee Casey)

Have you noticed a puzzled expression on your postman lately? I have, and this despite the fact that, from the time of Sophocles—he of the famous motto about the mail going through—to this date postmen are about the kindest group of citizens I know.

What's worrying your postman and mine is a matter of pay. He hasn't had an increase in salary since 1925—a full quarter-century. True, he did get a war bonus of \$300 a year to meet the increase in the cost

of living and higher income taxes. But this bonus will expire automatically July 1. So far as the postman is concerned, the Little Steel formula simply doesn't exist. So, naturally, he'd like to know something about where he stands.

In any event, he stands in a peculiar and difficult position.

When the rest of us feel we are entitled to a raise, we go, either individually or collectively, to our official superior. But the postman can't do that. Neither the postmaster nor the postmaster general has anything to say about a postman's pay. Congress is the sole judge of that question.

The postman is under difficulties there. He not only is not supposed to be, he actually isn't, in politics. He cannot lobby for himself, like most minority groups. He just has to wait for something to happen. So far, nothing has.

Last year it almost happened. A bill adjusting postmen's salaries passed the Lower House of Congress with only one dissenting vote. It was referred to a Senate committee, and died there.

Now, I'm not trying to say what the increase in the postman's salary should be. I haven't sufficient information to pass on that question. Even if I had, I lack the proper judicial aloofness. Temperamentally, I'm in favor of more money for everybody. I'm most assuredly in favor of more money for postmen. What with what they have to put up with, I don't think they are getting enough or ever will, no matter what the adjustment may be. As between postmen and most lawyers, for example, I'd say most emphatically that postmen are far more deserving.

But I think it is quite clear that the decision should be made on the merits of the case and that the postman's bill—which is officially H. R. 2071, known as the Salary Reclassification Act—should be brought out, discussed, and acted upon, instead of being shunted aside and lost as happened last year.

Colorado's four Members of the House voted for the bill last year and this year, of course, we have in the House those same familiar Republican faces. In addition, the quartet has declared for this legislation.

Thus far, however, the bill remains in the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and there is danger that it will remain there, as has happened with a lot of proposed legislation, good as well as bad, that was presented to the expiring Thirty-fifth Colorado General Assembly.

Our Congressmen are now back home in their respective districts, where their constituents can get a crack at them. While we have them here, I think it's a good idea for us to tell them we'd like to have that postman's bill brought out. The postman has done a fine job during the war and because of his peculiar relationship with the Government, only Congress can give him relief.

At least let's see what he needs and, when the case is proved, give him what he has coming. Certainly it would be a bad mistake to deprive the postman of his rights by the same old "died in committee" gag.

[From the Highland Chief, Denver, Colo., of April 12, 1945]

LETTER CARRIERS

In addition to their regular duties, Denver letter carriers this week are increasing their loads on their backs with leaflets which they are distributing to ask their friends and patrons to help them get the first increase in their basic pay in 20 years.

Last autumn patrons of the postal services all over the country wrote to their Senators and Congressmen urging that a measure, providing for adjustment of the salaries of letter carriers and other post-office workers, be

adopted. So widespread and effective was the appeal that the bill was passed by the House of Representatives with but one dissenting vote. In the Senate, however, the bill became involved in the last-minute legislative jam and the session adjourned without the measure being permitted to come to a vote.

In the present session of Congress a new measure, H. R. 2071, providing for the long-delayed financial relief of postal workers, has been introduced by their friends. Accordingly, these men and women who have seen their salaries fall far behind increased living costs are asking patrons to again write their Senators and Congressmen urging adoption of the measure which is designed to provide the needed adjustment in pay.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of April 20, 1945]

JUSTICE FOR POSTMEN

The Nation's postal workers are forgotten men. They have not been given a basic pay increase since 1925. Their \$300 annual bonus, enacted in 1943 as a temporary measure, will expire this June 30. Unless Congress approves new legislation, the 375,000 postal employees will be working for the same pay they received 20 years ago.

A bill to increase the thin pay envelope of letter carriers and other postal workers has been introduced in the House. We believe it to be good bill. It sets up a \$400 permanent raise in annual base pay. It provides time and a half for overtime, extra pay for night work and other deserving compensations.

During the last session of Congress a similar bill was passed by the House. It was lost in the shuffle in the Senate, however, during the preadjournment days. Now the postmen are waging another determined campaign to win support for the measure, and they request the American public to back the fight by writing Congressmen to approve it.

We join the postal workers in urging citizens of this area to write their Congressmen. It will be simple justice for Congress to pass this bill.

[From the Iowa City Press-Citizen of April 18, 1945]

AS VIEWED FROM HERE—POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES MAKE PLEA

Reg Manning's editorial cartoon on this page today gives emphasis to a matter brought further to our attention by a letter received from the Iowa City post office employees and addressed to the patrons of the Iowa City post office.

It concerns the salary received by postal employees in the United States.

But let the local postal employees' letter speak for itself; it states the case in behalf of the writers simply, but eloquently, and we believe warrants the consideration of all of us:

"During the past year your postal employees have been making a desperate effort to secure an increase in salary. At the close of the last session of Congress, the House had passed on a bill to make this possible, but the Senate failed to do so. Consequently, the temporary bonus which we now receive will expire for good June 30 this year, with nothing definite in sight except the salary which was established back in 1925.

"However, we are hoping that the present Congress will do something in our favor. There is almost nothing that we as postal employees can do. Therefore we are soliciting the interest and help of you, the public. If you feel we are worthy of that much of your interest and time, we urge you to write a letter to one or more of the following, telling them just how you feel about it: Senator

GEORGE A. WILSON, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, and Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN.

"We feel that a letter from one of our patrons will carry many times more weight than any letter we might send:

"If you are at all interested in writing such a letter, just hand it to your letter carrier or any window clerk, who in turn will be glad to furnish envelope and postage to mail same, unless you prefer sending it direct yourself.

"To help the public understand our case, we wish to present the following questions:

"1. Do you know we have had no raise since 1925?

"2. Do you know it takes an act of Congress to give us a raise?"

"3. Do you know our overtime pay is less than regular pay per hour?

"4. Do you know we receive less for Sunday and holiday time than for regular time?

"5. Do you know a raise for us could be encouraged by you?

"6. Do you think we deserve a raise?

"7. Will you help us in our efforts?

"8. Will you please write your Congressman?"

"9. How about it, folks? It's up to you.

"THE IOWA CITY POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES."

[From the Scrantonian, Scranton, Pa., April 29, 1945]

GIVE POSTAL WORKERS SALARY BOOST

On the home front, no group has done a better war job than the postal workers of the Nation. The Post Office Department has efficiently handled a vast volume of mail, sold stamps and bonds, assisted in the registration of aliens, and otherwise performed valued wartime services.

Because of the draft calls from among postal workers, the remaining staff has worked, in many places, short handed, but nevertheless service mail and packages have gone forward on schedule to the far ends of the earth. In the absence of any salary increases, the postal workers have stayed on the job, without any suggestion of a strike, or any disturbance to the service.

It will probably come as a shock to many people to learn that postal workers get the same pay as they did 20 years ago, with the exception of a \$300 per year cost-of-living bonus paid to each worker regardless of his base pay. This bonus has been paid only for 2 years and is due to expire on June 30.

Justice demands that the postal workers be granted a salary increase. A bill known as H. R. 2071 has been introduced in the House which would extend the \$300 bonus and increase it by \$100. If the bill fails to pass, postal workers' salary schedules will be back where they were in 1925. This must not be permitted to happen.

The postal workers deserve a reward for their faithful service. The public should rally to their cause and insure enactment of this needed salary-increasing legislation.

[From the Minneapolis Labor Review of April 6, 1945]

INJUSTICE THAT HAS BECOME OUTRAGE

When a rank injustice that should be and can be eradicated is permitted to continue it becomes an outrage.

The particular outrage we have in mind is the failure of Uncle Sam to raise the pay of postal employees for more than 20 years. There is no reason why these servants of the people should be discriminated against, and there are plenty of reasons why this condition should be remedied at once.

Post office employees include post office motor-vehicle employees, special delivery messengers, post office clerks, letter carriers, railway-mail-service mail handlers, railway mail clerks, and other Government employees.

There are 3,500 of these workers in the Twin Cities.

It means that this large number of families in this territory are suffering grievously, to say nothing of the great numbers throughout the entire Nation.

There have been substantial raises in postage rates, but none of these raises have leaked into the pay envelopes of the postal employees.

There is now before Congress H. R. 2071 that provides for an increase in wages for postal employees. It is not the amount of increase that it should be, but these workers through their various organizations have expressed their acceptance of what the bill has to offer.

In order for these workers and their families to receive what benefits this bill provides it will be necessary for many of you to write to their Congressmen and Senators urging the passage of this measure, H. R. 2071.

These workers who have so patiently waited for this far too long delayed pay increase are all members of organized labor. They are hard-working employees who surmount all vagaries of weather and all obstacles to see that your mail gets to you.

In the American Federation of Labor the members call one another brothers. Here is a situation that demands a demonstration of that brotherhood at least to the extent of writing a letter to your Congressman and United States Senator urging the passage of H. R. 2071.

In all war activities these workers are making their contributions just as are those who have received pay raises. When the war-bond salesman come, post office employees do not say, "Wait until Congress raises my pay, then I will buy bonds." When the Red Cross folks rap at the door, post office employees do not say, "Wait until Congress raises my pay, then I will contribute to the Red Cross." No, they ask no delay, they contribute just like everyone else, but they know it means less food on the family table, poorer clothing for the family, that the husband passes up the new suit he needs, and the wife is compelled to forget the new Easter bonnet she had set her heart upon.

It means medical service that is needed has to be put off, and dental work has to be postponed.

So it has been for more than 20 years. Not so exacting as now with the war contributions added. But this 20 years of delay has made life rather doleful for postal employees and their families to say the least.

Perhaps the Congressmen and Senators mean well, but they have many things pressing for action, particularly in wartime. So we urge you to pile in those letters so that Congressmen and Senators will appreciate that this long overdue pay raise for post office employees is something that can no longer be postponed.

See that Uncle Sam through the action of Senators and Congressmen applies some justice to this injustice that has become an outrage, by enacting H. R. 2071 now.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Labor Union]

POST OFFICE WORKERS SEEK AID ON WAGE BILL

Employees of the Middletown post office, all of whom are members of the American Federation of Labor, are again urging their fellow unionists and all citizens of the city to back them in their efforts to obtain wage legislation.

Postal employees and members of Middletown civic clubs 6 months ago circulated petitions for such national legislation. These petitions were forwarded to Members of Congress. Petitions were also sent to United States Senators ROBERT TAFT, of Cincinnati, and HAROLD BURTON, of Cleveland, urging them to act in behalf of the postal employees.

Nearly 2 years ago Congress granted postal employees a war bonus of \$6 per week, their first pay increase since 1925. The bonus provision expires this coming June. To take its place a new bill, H. R. 2071, has been introduced. This bill proposes an increase of \$1.30 per week over what the postal employee is now receiving. If this bill be not passed by July 1 they will take a cut of \$6 per week.

To prevent a pay cut the postal employees are urging all unionists, friends of organized labor, and their other friends to support them in their fight for passage of H. R. 2071. It is being urged that letters be written to Congressman EDWARD J. GARDNER and to Senators TAFT and BURTON seeking their support of this bill.

Hilbert Martin, assistant postmaster at Middletown, who has frequently addressed sessions of the Middletown Trades and Labor Council, and is a booster for his associated workers in the post office, is backing the postal employees 100 percent in their fight for this legislation.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 21, 1945]

RAISE POSTAL WORKER'S PAY

Postal workers have a just complaint against their employer, the Government, and they've had it a long time. For their last salary raise came under President Coolidge, 20 years ago, when the maximum was put at \$2,100, instead of \$1,800.

Since then they've seen the cost of living go sky high, taxes increase so fast as to make their heads swim and millions of industrial workers enjoying the largest wages they have ever earned. The postal worker is the forgotten man.

Congress finally did grant the mailmen a temporary bonus of \$300 a year, which expires June 30. But what they are asking is a modest \$400-a-year salary increase without the bonus, with overtime based on a 40-hour week. A bill to this end is now before a House committee. A similar measure, passed by the House at the last session, was tangled up in the Senate.

The new bill should be passed without further delay. At best it will be a tardy act of partial justice to these faithful servants of the people.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of May 5, 1945]

JUSTICE LONG DELAYED

The Post Office Committee of the House of Representatives, after many weeks of consideration, has finally given favorable and unanimous action to the long-pending measure designed to give the thousands of postal workers in the United States their first basic-pay increase in 20 years.

This is an important step in the direction of according justice to the postal workers; but, of course, only a step.

Many times in recent years the postal workers have seen their petition for adequate pay get this far, and no farther.

Committees have reported favorably on the matter before, without achieving the ends of acknowledged justice.

On several occasions one House or the other of Congress has actually passed the postal pay-increase bill.

But it is no credit to the Congress, and none to the country as a whole, that none of these steps in the right direction have ever resulted in upward adjustment of the shamefully low pay of the postal workers.

This time the bill must pass.

This is true because it is no longer only a matter of doing simple justice to the postal workers that is involved.

President William C. Doherty of the National Association of Letter Carriers made this clear in a recent letter to Mr. William Randolph Hearst.

Mr. Doherty wrote to Mr. Hearst because, as he said:

"The Hearst newspapers have had a wholesome effect in focusing public attention to the plight of the postal workers.

"The crusade conducted by your newspapers," he continued, "stands out like a beacon light.

"Every citizen should be grateful for the magnificent manner in which you have sounded the warning.

"There still exists a grave danger—the development of an inferior postal system."

That is the real danger in the present situation.

If continued injustice to the postal workers simply meant that these hundreds of thousands of vital workers would be compelled to exist on the substandard living wage they have endured for the last 20 years, it would be bad enough.

Mr. Doherty points out something worse.

"Manpower shortages within the postal service are already acute," he warns.

"Management is finding it practically impossible to recruit needed personnel on the present outmoded pay schedules.

"Existing critical conditions are no longer a matter affecting letter carriers and postal workers alone.

"Let it be said that the very future of the postal service and the fate of its personnel now rest with the Seventy-ninth Congress."

The future of the postal service is at stake because the underpaid postal workers are tired of substandard living, tired after 20 years of futile waiting for the performance and fulfillment of broken promises.

Accordingly, thousands of them have already gone into other fields of employment where they can live the American way, and other thousands will follow them if the present Congress falls down on its promises and duty, as the previous sessions of Congress have been doing for the last 20 years.

If for no other reason than the simple justice of the matter, Congress should approve the postal-pay-increase bill; but in the vital public interest of preserving our essential and efficient postal system it must do so.

[From the West Hartford Metropolitan News of May 4, 1945]

ARE POSTAL WORKERS PEOPLE?

We often have been intrigued with the idea of stepping up to our mailman or to the clerk who sells us a few stamps, and asking him if he also belongs to the human race. We know that the mailman who delivers the good and the bad in his mail sack, and the clerk who sells us money orders, tax stamps, and war bonds, must live in a house, he must buy clothes, and he evidently eats, maybe too, he has a family to support. He must be above average intelligence or he wouldn't have been able to pass the civil-service test to get the job.

The reason we were intrigued with the postal-service personnel, is that we have been looking over the Federal expenditures during the past 20 years and when we came to the Post Office Department we were amazed and shocked to learn that base pay of these faithful public servants is the same rate in effect in 1925. Twenty years without an increase.

It's hard to believe, but it's true, your postman or clerk hasn't had a raise in all that time. You and I know that we pay more for postage, the Post Office Department shows a better profit and you go to the post office more often, meaning many new lines have been added.

During the present war, the postal worker has been most loyal to his profession; he has watched the big money jobs on the next block, he has watched the money orders grow in powerful figures, and he has watched the draft deferments for other youngsters while

he is still subject to a call from Uncle Sam. The postal worker has to pay the same increased costs of living that we do, like us, he pays more rent and he pays more taxes.

The annual salary of a postal worker is \$2,100, out of this is deducted a withholding tax and retirement contributions, leaving him \$1,500 with which to feed and clothe himself and his family and pay for any other knickknacks he may desire. If someone gave a post-office worker a car, in all probability he wouldn't have enough money with which to run it.

During the past 2 years, Congress has been giving these postal workers a \$300 bonus, this largess expires in June, it meant for many, the difference between their chosen career or finding another job in their leisure hours. The postal worker is not allowed to campaign under the Federal statutes. If he was he could throw an avalanche of high pressure at Congress. He could point out that out of all the money given away during the past 20 years, he is the only forgotten man.

The only voluble voice the postal worker has is the people for whom he toils, that's us, we expect good service, we like to see the mail man, he's the guy who plods up to your door in fair weather and foul, he's the guy who carries that letter to your son out in the vast wastelands on some Pacific atoll, he's the same guy who brings you the welcome letter from your son, written from a fox-hole on Okinawa or in Germany, all you see is the front view, take a look at him as he plows through the snow down your walk, note the patches in his pants or on his elbows, he's the same guy who hasn't had an increase in his pay for 20 years. Don't fool yourself, if he quits his job, you'll not get your mail so regularly.

The postal worker doesn't want any more sympathy, he is no doubt weary of 20 years of promises by the Congress. Your postal worker just wants a fair break, no more, no less.

At the present time there is before Congress, bill H. R. 2071. Under this bill the postal worker is assured some justice to the extent that the base pay would be increased up to \$400 per year.

If this or a similar bill is not passed by the present Congress, America will be faced by a breakdown in its postal service through a serious help shortage.

Every American citizen who resents the protracted injustice against the postal workers should take the time to write to his Congressman their approval of this measure so that these workers will be allowed to live and support their families according to American standards and to eradicate an injustice that has so long endured.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of May 17, 1945]

TOWARD JUSTICE

The House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 360 to 1, has approved the Burch bill for reclassification of postal workers.

When and if it is finally approved by the Senate and the President, this legislation will right two basic wrongs:

Foremost, it will give the employees of the United States Post Office—who are in closer contact with the people than any other public servants—the first pay raise they have had in 20 years.

Second, it will stop the deterioration of one of our finest governmental services, which has been occasioned by the plain fact that a wage which offers only a bare subsistence likewise offers no attraction to ambitious young persons seeking a life career.

Indeed, the present pay rates already have driven many fine and loyal workers from the ranks of the postal service.

That the deterioration so far has been slight is a tribute to the fidelity of the aver-

age postal worker, who has stuck to his job in the face of the wartime inflation which imposed the most stringent economies on him and his family.

But the danger of deterioration is real, as Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, pointed out in a recent letter to Mr. William Randolph Hearst.

"Manpower shortages within the postal service are already acute," Mr. Doherty said. "Management is finding it practically impossible to recruit needed personnel on the present outmoded pay schedules. Existing critical conditions are no longer a matter affecting letter carriers and postal employees alone. It is definitely in the public interest that the Burch bill be enacted into law without further delay."

The Hearst newspapers have long fought the postman's battle, maintaining that he is grossly underpaid on a job that is one of the oldest and most important in the service of the people.

On July 1 a temporary \$300 annual cost-of-living "bonus" will expire. If the Burch bill is not passed and signed by then, the average postal worker, whose base salary is \$2,100, will have left to live on after taxes and retirement contributions exactly \$1,575—\$30.20 a week.

This is not a living, much less a decent subsistence for a segment of our best citizenship—men and women who have homes to maintain, families to feed and clothe, children to educate.

The Burch bill will grant an immediate pay raise of only \$400 a year. It will set up classifications so that, over a period of many years, workers in large cities may hope to earn \$3,000 annually, and those in smaller cities and rural areas \$2,700.

Under the present system a postal worker reaches within 5 years the maximum he can ever hope to earn.

The House, by its all-but-unanimous approval of the Burch bill, has accurately reflected the opinion of the vast majority of the people.

We hope and recommend the Senate will act as speedily and as resoundingly. And that President Truman, with his signature, will execute the final act to bring to a fair level salaries that were substandard long before the Little Steel formula was ever heard of.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 28, 1945]

JUSTICE FOR THE POSTMAN

This should be the year the postman gets a break. If it is, it will be the first year in the last 20.

Your postman hasn't had a raise since 1925. His wages were substandard long before anyone ever heard of the Little Steel formula.

He has held his family together and maintained his dignity as one of our best citizens and highest types of public servant only by dint of the most stringent personal economy.

Now the Burch bill, sponsored by Representative THOMAS G. BURCH, of Virginia, has been reported out with the unanimous approval of the House Post Office Committee.

The Burch bill would immediately raise postal base pay from \$2,100 to \$2,500, grant time and one-half overtime based on a 40-hour week, and give an opportunity for workers in large cities to be upgraded to \$3,000 a year (\$2,700 in smaller cities) over a long period of years.

These benefits, adding up to nothing more than plain and simple justice, would cost the Government annually only about one-third of the present year's \$100,000,000 postal profits.

If the bill does not pass by June 30, the date when the present annual emergency bonus of \$300 expires, the average postman will have exactly \$1,575 left to live on after taxes and retirement fees.

No more good men would go into the service; thousands would leave it; the general public would suffer. This must not happen. Congress and President Truman should quickly approve the Burch bill, against which no voice can be raised.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News of March 21, 1945]

POST-OFFICE EMPLOYEES MAY GET RAISE AT LAST—NO INCREASE IN 20 YEARS—WRITE TO YOUR SENATOR, TO STOP ANY FINAGLING

(By Lee Ellmaker)

We never could understand why post-office employees were objects of discrimination in Congress, when large numbers live in every congressional district in the United States.

Right now postal employees are getting \$300 a year war bonus. Prior to that, they didn't have a raise for almost a fifth of a century.

The chairman of the House Post Office Committee, Representative BURCH, of Virginia, has introduced a bill giving them a permanent raise of \$400—\$100 over their wartime pay.

We believe postal employees are entitled to this, and more. We believe when the Post Office Committee of the House reports this bill, it should be railroaded into the Senate, so there will be no last-minute technicalities to delay it, as happened 2 years ago.

If every postal employee in the United States would let their Senators know about this, the Senators would not try finagling again.

[From the Los Angeles Evening Herald Express of March 21, 1945]

INCREASED POSTAL PAY—STATE LEGISLATURE URGES CONGRESS TO GIVE POST-OFFICE WORKERS \$400-A-YEAR INCREASE

Good Americans will heartily approve the action of the California State Legislature in forwarding to Congress a resolution urging that action be taken to grant permanent salary increases of \$400 to employees of the United States Post Office.

This is a matter which calls for the immediate attention of Congress and is a matter which should have the complete approval of that body.

The postman is the most faithful, conscientious, and reliable of our public employees, yet he has been neglected more than any other. In the face of a much-increased cost of living, postal employees have not had a basic-pay increase since 1925—19 years ago.

It is true that a temporary wartime bonus of \$300 was voted a short time ago, but even that increase is scheduled to expire next year.

The California Legislature is to be congratulated on having taken up the cause of the postal employee, and it is to be hoped that Congress will see its way clear to heed the resolution this State has sent to Washington.

The American people owe much to the postal workers, a debt which should be paid.

[From the Chicago Daily News of April 10, 1945]

FIFTY OF MY BOYS ARE OVERSEAS—MAILMAN RINGS TWICE FOR GI LETTERS

(By Sue Mahrer)

A sympathetic word, a quiet bit of encouragement, or a World War I anecdote . . . these are the things Mailman Frank G. Williams delivers with his letters.

A hero in World War I in which he was a messenger runner, the slight postman passes out home-front morale with mail to his customers in the Edgebrook and Lincolnwood areas.

"I have 230 houses on my 34-block route," he explained. "There are 50 of my boys overseas and 24 still in this country."

Williams was a member of the Ninth Infantry during the last war and won the Croix de Guerre with Palm from the French Government for carrying messages through heavy artillery fire for seven consecutive days.

The United States awarded him the Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart. Although wounded by shrapnel in the arm, he continued to run messages near Blanc Mont Ridge, refusing to be relieved. He was eighteen at the time.

"I guess I ran some mighty secret and important mail back there in Germany, but none of it was as important as the letters I deliver every day right here at home," he said.

One of his best "clients" is Mrs. Marie McLaughlin, 6655 Central Avenue. She has four boys in service. One has recently been honorably discharged. "Every bit of mail I deliver to her is mighty important."

Brown-eyed Frank always rings twice when there is a letter from a serviceman, and he puts in a whistle for good measure.

While on his route, if he sees a girl rushing to catch the 8:35 for work, he pulls out that awaited letter from her sweetheart or husband and gives it to her before she boards the train.

Anxious mothers, wives, and GI girl friends are always asking him for information from his own war experiences. "I just tell them what the medals mean or what the initials on the soldier's return address stand for," Frank says.

Two new "morale" clients on Frank's route are the parents of Constance Kullerstron, 6430 Spokane Avenue, who recently enlisted in the Army Nurse Corps.

Recently he delivered the Purple Heart Medal to Mrs. Lawrence Schnittgen, mother of Lt. Larry Schnittgen, 6656 Sauganash Avenue. "Larry will be all right," he answered Mrs. Schnittgen. "Our boys get the finest medical care in the world."

Frank, who is 46, has been in the mail service since 1927. He lives with his wife, Ruth, and son, Richard, 7, at 6521 Ebinger Avenue, Niles, Ill. When he isn't doing double duty of delivering mail and building morale, he likes to work in his victory garden.

[From the Philadelphia Record of March 22, 1945]

UNCLE SAM'S UNDERPAID

Most of the arguments about increase in pay involved the Little Steel formula, based on increases in cost of living since January 1, 1941.

A workman whose pay hasn't gone up since then can point to the increase in the cost of living the past 4 years and put up an argument the Government listens to.

But postal employees haven't had an increase in basic pay since 1925.

Congress is now considering a bill which would make permanent a \$400-a-year bonus granted to meet at least partly the increase in cost of living. Unless Congress acts by June 30, the Post Office employees will lose the bonus for next year and in effect get a wage cut.

In all fairness to a hard-working group of Government employees, Congress should act promptly to make the temporary bonus part of the permanent wage scale.

[From the Long Island (N. Y.) Daily Press of March 22, 1945]

LATHAM ASKS POSTAL RAISE

WASHINGTON.—Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM, Queens Village Republican, today appeared before the House Committee on Post-offices and Post Roads, at the hearing on the Burch bill, and pleaded that the postal workers be given an immediate raise of \$400 and an opportunity to be upgraded in large cities to \$3,000 a year over a period of years.

"The letter carriers," LATHAM said, "are in my opinion the hardest working group of public servants on the pay roll. They tramp the streets day in and day out, in good weather and bad, to see that the mail is delivered promptly. They stand out in contrast to the many baffling bureaucrats who infest the public pay rolls.

"The postman's maximum salary now is \$2,100 a year. He hasn't had a raise in 20 years, and today finds himself financially squeezed between the increased cost of living and high wartime taxes which reduce even his small income. How he manages to exist is a mystery.

"The letter carriers and postal clerks have helped to earn the profit which the Post Office Department returns to the Treasury each year."

[From the Denver (Colo.) Colorado of April 7, 1945]

SHOULD RECEIVE RAISE IN SALARY

Last week Denver letter carriers distributed 20,000 letters to Denver patrons asking each to write to United States Senators JOHNSON and MILLIKIN and Congressman GILLESPIE, urging them to work for passage of House Resolution 2071, known as the salary reclassification act.

It is stressed in their letter that the cost of living has gone up more than 40 percent in the last 4 years, while their basic pay has remained the same for 20 years. Also during the depression they took a 27 percent cut in salary.

Colorado feels that the mail carriers are deserving of an increase in salary and urges Senators JOHNSON and MILLIKIN as well as Congressman GILLESPIE to work for the passage of House Resolution 2071.

[From the Colorado Labor Advocate, Denver, Colo., April 12, 1945]

HELP THE POSTAL WORKERS GET A RAISE IN PAY (By Frank J. Woertman)

Spurred on by the fact that they have not received a permanent pay increase in the last 20 years, the postal employees of the United States are banding themselves together, both nationally and locally, in one supreme effort to bring about the enactment of H. R. 2071, a salary reclassification bill which will place each individual group in a salary bracket more closely in line with those used by private enterprise.

Locally, a legislative committee has been formed, composed of representatives of all postal groups. The committee is working with a zeal never before shown in any previous campaign.

United for one common purpose, they are going forward with plans, which, if given the proper support, will culminate in reaching the goal which they so ardently strive to obtain.

One of the more recent of the committee's efforts is a circular, which the mail carriers have distributed on their routes. This circular portrays the postal employee as the forgotten man of these wartime days. It proves to even the most skeptical, that present pay standards and present price levels leave these workers with a problem which they find it impossible to figure out.

Some relief was given them by Congress—a \$25 a month bonus—but even this runs out on the 1st of July this year, leaving them stranded with a 1925 salary in an expensive 1945.

The one glimmer of hope is the bill now pending in the Congress.

Known officially as H. R. 2071, this bill would give to postal employees a \$400 a year raise in pay. They are asking their friends in the great labor movement to give them the support which they so desperately need.

They urge them to read carefully the above mentioned circular and to write immediately

both their Congressman and their Senators asking them to lend their efforts to the passing of this bill.

With the concentrated support of labor, it is felt that success will finally crown their attempt and place them closer to the standard which most workers now enjoy, and which they all so richly deserve. Remember, write for H. R. 2071 today.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of March 23, 1945]

MAIL CARRIERS PLEAD FOR RAISE

WASHINGTON, March 22.—William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, told the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee today that the future of the service depends on passage of the Burch bill, granting an immediate \$400 basic annual pay raise.

Testifying the legislation, introduced by committee chairman BURCH (Democrat, Virginia), Doherty said the manpower shortage in the service will become worse unless pay is increased. He added:

"Full responsibility for the postal system rests with Congress.

"Once again all records for mail volume and receipts have been broken. That accomplishment has been achieved despite the most serious manpower shortage in the history of the service."

Doherty said his organization represents 63,000 dues-paying, A. F. of L. members in 3,700 cities and towns and "the organization is the sole spokesman for the carriers of the Nation."

The bill provides a basic \$400 raise, plus time-and-a-half after 40 hours, and a system of upgrading which allows postal workers in most cities to achieve a \$3,000 annual wage over a period of years.

"It would appear," he said, "that at long last the carrier will be given an equal opportunity with his fellow Americans to share in a decent standard of living."

[From the Western News, Denver, Colo., of April 5, 1945]

In addition to their regular duties, Denver letter carriers this week are increasing their loads on their backs with leaflets which they are distributing to ask their friends and patrons to help them get the first increase in their basic pay in 20 years. Last autumn patrons of the postal service all over the country wrote to their Senators and Congressmen urging that a measure, providing for adjustment of the salaries of letter carriers and other post-office workers, be adopted. So widespread and effective was the appeal that the bill was passed by the House of Representatives with but one dissenting vote. In the Senate, however, the bill became involved in the last-minute legislative jam and the session adjourned without the measure being permitted to come to a vote. In the present session of Congress a new measure, H. R. 2071, providing for the long-delayed financial relief of postal workers, has been introduced by their friends. Accordingly, these men and women who have seen their salaries fall far behind increased living costs, are asking patrons to again write their Senators and Congressmen urging adoption of the measure which is designed to provide the needed adjustment in pay.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., April 5, 1945]

HIS PACK IS HEAVY BUT HIS PAY LIGHT

The organization is called the National Association of Letter Carriers. It ought to be known as the organization of letter-postcard-paper-package carriers. Whatever the weather, however bulging the pack, these gray-clad carriers are on the job.

When mail is uncommonly heavy, they deliver it with the same good cheer as when duties, never light, are not quite so heavy.

And they deserve pay that, to some nominal degree, is proportioned to the value, the importance, and the exhausting character of the service they render. They deserve pay fitted to the increases in living costs which letter carriers like other public servants—like anybody else—have been forced to meet.

Pending in the Congress is the salary reclassification bill H. R. 2071, introduced by Representative BURCH, which provides a \$400 yearly up for your postal employee, plus time and a half for all overtime. The \$300 yearly bonus provided for war expires June 30 next.

There are a couple of things mighty easy to say about the postal employees. For nearly 20 years they've had no permanent pay increase, and they preeminently deserve it. The Congress should pass the Burch bill in behalf of letter carriers without delay.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 23, 1945]

THE CARRIERS ASK HELP

The Milwaukee branch of the National Association of Letter Carriers appeals to the public for support of a bill introduced in the House of Representatives designed to bring relief to a hard-worked and insufficiently rewarded body of public servants.

The bill is H. R. 2071, introduced at the request of the Post Office Department after careful study, and provides for an immediate increase in the pay of these faithful workers.

No body of men in the United States work more faithfully than the postal employees.

And no body of public servants receive less adequate compensation for their efforts.

The Sentinel and the other Hearst papers have supported earnestly and vigorously the various efforts which have been made to bring the compensation of postal employees to somewhere near the level of that enjoyed by other workers, and we think that the appeal of the Milwaukee carriers should be heeded by our citizens.

Postal employees have no way of improving their financial condition except through action of Congress. They cannot resort to methods used by other workers but must depend on the understanding of their needs by the national lawmakers.

This understanding has not been apparent. The question of postal workers' pay has repeatedly been evaded, and, as these columns have pointed out, their compensation has not kept pace with rising living costs or with comparative compensation in private employment.

The Milwaukee carriers ask their friends to write to their Congressmen to urge support of H. R. 2071. The request is a proper one and one that should be heeded by all citizens who are desirous of seeing fair play for diligent, hard-working, faithful servants of the public.

[From the New York Journal-American of March 23, 1945]

POSTAL EMPLOYEES ASK RECOGNITION OF BURDENS

EDITOR, NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN,
New York, N. Y.

Sir: The Burch reclassification of salary bill, designated as H. R. 2071, now pending before the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee for consideration, which would grant an increase of \$400 per annum for postal employees above their present basic pay, should be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

This measure, which is backed up by the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, with a membership of over 35,000 postal employees throughout the country, is only looking to the doing of simple justice.

It seems to me nobody can possibly be against it.

The postal employees are loyal without question; they are thoroughly worthy. Their task is much greater during the impending emergency than they have had before.

They have had many inescapable burdens placed upon them by this impending emergency; and yet, in the face of disheartening conditions, they have served faithfully and efficiently.

The request for an increase in their pay is a simple one of obvious justice.

Sometimes it seems to be human nature to overlook those men who do most for us, to take their efforts as a matter of course. It seems that this group has been overlooked now for 20 years.

As we all know very well, the cost of living has gone up over 30 percent; this despite ceiling prices.

Unquestionably the postal workers are losing in what at one time was a race between wages and prices, but has now become a runaway with prices far in the lead.

Workers in private industry who can negotiate collectively with their employers have been able to contract for increased wages and such wages generally have been increased either by agreement or through the War Labor Board since it was established.

Certainly the postal employees do not have to be shown facts and figures to know what has happened to the purchasing power of their dollar.

The United National Association of Post Office Clerks is advocating the passage of the Burch bill because there is urgent need for increased compensation on a permanent basis for postal employees:

First, because they absolutely need it to overcome the increased cost of living.

Secondly, they deserve it because they have rendered efficient service over many years and during the last 20 years they have not received any recognition by way of increased compensation.

Public opinion expressed from all parts of the Nation and groups of our citizens with unanimity is back of this bill.

Income taxes, pension contributions, and the cost-of-living increase will eat up whatever benefit is conferred by the proposed salary legislation.

Most individual postal employees enter the postal service with a view of making it a lifetime profession. Salaries in the postal department have not kept pace with workers in many industries.

The Burch bill is tardy recognition of a well-merited claim. The temporary \$300 bonus granted will expire June 30 of this year. Unless Congress passes the Burch bill, postal employees and their families will find themselves in a very precarious economic plight.

Under present salary schedules the young man who enters the postal service starts at a salary of \$1,700 a year after subbing for several years, and receives an increase of \$100 a year thereafter for 4 years. This is as far as he can go.

Twenty-one hundred dollars is the maximum he can look forward to. This schedule was established back in 1925. As the years have passed it has been impossible for them to make ends meet.

The average salary of a postal clerk or letter carrier is \$2,000 plus the temporary \$300 bonus, which brings the average salary up to a maximum of \$2,300.

Deduct his income taxes plus his pension contributions from this amount and he is lucky to have \$1,900 a year, or about \$38 a week, left to maintain himself and his dependents.

One of the great domestic issues of the day is the establishment of a proper relationship between employer and employee, which must include proper recompense for the work done and adequate pay so an employee may bring

his family up to the American fashion and in accordance to American standards.

Government in the past few years has been particularly concerned about the problem, as far as the industrial life of the Nation is concerned, and it should certainly treat its own employees in the way it expects businessmen to treat theirs.

Furthermore, postal employees are not receiving the regular pay for overtime services. As we all know, most employees, particularly those in private industry, receive time and one-half for overtime but postal employees receive only straight time.

Now they are appealing to the American people and the Congress, requesting that some recognition of appreciation be given for past services and present onerous burdens.

Let us give heart and hope to the postal employees as he gives his life to the great services that touches every hand and home of the Nation.

MAXWELL LICKER,
New York Post Office Clerks Association,
Branch 1, New York, N. Y.

[From the Philadelphia Daily News of April 12, 1945]

POSTMEN WANT A RAISE

The man who delivers the mail and all the army of other postal employees with him are seeking a permanent raise in their basic wages.

These faithful employees in Government service have had no raise since the beginning of 1925. During the depression years they had to take a pay cut of 27 percent which was restored in 1935.

Then in May, 2 years ago, they were granted a temporary annual bonus of \$300, half of which they lost immediately in the withholding tax.

The emergency legislation which provided for this special bonus expires in 2 months. The Burch reclassification bill which is being considered by the House Post Office Committee would allow a permanent increase of \$400 a year and upgrading of salaries that start at \$1,700 a year and which reach \$3,000 after a postal employee has served on his job for 26 years.

These upgradings would affect many thousands of workers upon whom we depend for the efficiency of our postal service. Most of them are carriers or rated as clerks. No one can say that the pay these men and women receive is excessive for the duties they perform.

The post office in every community is one agency where chronic and large scale absenteeism would create havoc in the service. Whether in winter storms or summer heat the letter carrier delivers his mail, and so dependable is he that Americans take him for granted, which is the best evidence of faith in the reliability of his performance.

The postal service personnel must depend on the understanding and sympathetic support of the public to get them what they deserve. They may consider themselves underpaid or overworked but they can't indulge in a work stoppage such as some other employed Americans have indulged in because they weren't satisfied with working conditions.

The men who man the postal routes, whether it be the central areas of a big city or to the rural delivery boxes at the end of a country lane, these Government employees have a right to expect better wage rates than they received 20 years ago.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal of April 5, 1945]

THEY'RE ASKING FOR IT

The letter carriers—those hard-working Government employees who bring the mail to your door in winter and summer—are urging people to write more letters. They are actually asking for more work.

The reason behind this request is a wage increase bill now before Congress. The postal workers figure that if Congressmen get a flood of mail from constituents endorsing the measure, the chances of getting it passed will be increased.

Frankly, we think the postal workers are entitled to a raise. They haven't had a basic pay increase in 20 years. In 1943 they were given a temporary wartime bonus of \$300 a year, but that will end July 1 of this year. And unless Congress approves the new measure, which provides for a \$400-a-year increase, they'll go back to their 1925 scale.

The postal workers aren't pounding desks or making threats. Quietly and earnestly, they are asking for a raise they feel is deserved. They are asking support for their case, in letters to Senators and Congressmen.

[From the Yonkers (N. Y.) Herald-Statesman of March 21, 1945]

FAITHFUL TO "THEIR APPOINTED ROUNDS"

Before the Seventy-ninth Congress is H. R. 2071, behind which, we are confident, will be the support of a large majority of the residents of this city as well as of Westchester County. It is a bill designed to lift salaries of postal employees to meet increased living costs.

Note that this is not an appropriation measure to offset wartime increases of living costs. Postal employees have not received a salary increase since 1925, and they receive less pay for overtime than they do for regular time.

There is at present a \$300 bonus, but this expires on June 30. And even with due consideration of this bonus, 20 years is entirely too long a time to wait for adjustment of salaries to meet the advances in living costs which have come in those two decades.

H. R. 2071 proposes to give mail carriers in city delivery service pay ranging from \$1,700 to \$2,700. There is also provision for an 8-hour day, compensatory time for work on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays; overtime pay in emergencies requiring more than an 8-hour workday; a 10-percent differential for night work; a 15-day vacation with pay.

The bill in general raises salaries of postmasters, clerks, and other postal employees, but it is the faithful letter carrier in whom we are most interested. Of these, says Herbert Gebhardt, of Yonkers, secretary of the New York State Association of Letter Carriers, comprising 11,000 members:

"Our contact is the closest of any service employee throughout this Nation, and no matter how tough the weather may be or how large a load we have to carry, our good friends the general public look for us around the same time every day. And very seldom do we fail them.

"For some reason, the powers that be have given us the so-called run-around and stagnated us to such an extent that we cannot continue under such a foreign existence. We want to live like real American citizens."

Those are true words. The average letter carrier is a friend to nearly all upon his route. He comes to know the members of the families, their troubles and their jobs, and to share in them, albeit vicariously. To him, the delivery to a family of a delayed letter from a boy over there is as welcome responsibility as it is a comfort to those who receive it, and probably detain him to hear excerpts. Day in and day out, he plods his way with heavy pack but a faithful heart.

It was Herodotus who wrote, and Woodrow Wilson who translated, that excellent tribute engraved upon the facade of the general post office in New York City. "Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stops these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

We suggest that the time has come when those who agree with that sentiment should do something about it. The best thing would be to let your Congressman and your

Senator know that you favor early passage of H. R. 2071.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of April 22, 1945]

POSTAL WORKERS' CASE

EDITOR, DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE:

A bill now before Congress, known as H. R. 2071, increasing the salary of postal employees, is soon to be enacted upon. For over 20 years no increase has been given this class of workers. As we retrospect one may ask, is this increase justified? When Civil Service was first enacted, the minimum salary was \$600, the maximum \$800 yearly. In those days rentals were from \$15 monthly, a roast of pork or veal of 3 pounds could be purchased for 30 cents, chickens, steaks, hams, as low as 13 cents per pound, eggs 12 cents a dozen, butter at 18 cents a pound, a soup bone thrown in, with dog meat if asked for (today that soup bone costs 50 cents or more with emphasis on the bone), potatoes 30 to 50 cents a bushel, coal \$4 to \$5 a ton in your bin, carrier's uniform cost \$12.50 for summer, \$16 for winter. Today they range for summer \$30.95 to \$36.20, winter \$34.95, 18-ounce cloth, to \$47.85, 24-ounce cloth. Shoes were bought for \$2.50 to \$3, strong and durable. These are only a few samples by comparison with today's prices. As time rolled on salaries increased to \$2,100 a year, then remained static for 20 years.

Your carrier serves you in sunshine and in storm, he is indefatigable in the discharge of his duties, uncomplaining, honest, assiduous, and industrious. He shares your joys and your sorrows. He often does you favors which he is not obligated to do, and in this he is sustained by postal laws and regulations. He doesn't recognize race, creed, or color; the humble or the pauper gets the same consideration as the aristocrat. He may sometime have a frown and appear to you sullen, but be tolerant, perhaps anguish or sickness has crossed his path. Remember we are subject to this same feeling. The pathway to a clerkship is not strewn with roses; thorns often appear before reaching the maximum salary. He must climb the ladder of the lower grades as carriers do; the procedure is slow before he reaches the coveted goal of \$2,100 a year. It has been as long as 4 years for carriers and clerks to reach the summit. He then must submit to the inevitable, which means an all night trick often lasting for years. He is then advanced to afternoon trick. Through seniority, it may be by an occasional retirement, removal for cause, sometimes by death, he reaches his zenith when advanced to a steady day trick as stated before. He is demerited for any omission but goes on unperturbed. Many clerks are all day on their feet. Some have what is known as rest bars but they must not be compared to a cushioned seat. It's a stanchion with a block of wood 6 by 10 inches, adjusted at an angle. If used all day it would cause mental agitation and disquietude.

After their withholding tax is deducted, 5 percent of their salary retirement retained, and their church obligation met, buying of war bonds, educating their children, their meat, grocery, and doctor bills paid, it is left to the imagination what is left for any recreation.

Unlike our policemen and firemen, their dependents receive no pension from the Government, and often find themselves in financial difficulty. These men are the most efficient, the hardest worked in all the country's service, and the poorest paid. In all the Government service it has no more honest, no more tireless, no more faithful employees. Their claims are just and should be recognized, and should be encouraged by every citizen.

Invoke the aid of your Representatives in Congress, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, GEORGE F. ROGERS, Senator ROBERT WAGNER and JAMES

MEAD, Washington, D. C., and reward your faithful servants for their meritorious service.

L. F. PROZELLER.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 11, 1945]

MORE PAY FOR THE POSTMAN

Letter carriers and other post-office employees have received no increase in basic pay since February 28, 1925. During the depression they had to take a pay cut of 27 percent. This was restored in 1935, and on May 1, 1943, a temporary annual bonus of \$300 was awarded them, which was cut in half almost immediately by the withholding tax. The legislation providing for this bonus expires next June 30. So now they are pressing for the passage of the Burch reclassification bill, which is being considered by the House Post Office Committee and which would grant a \$400 permanent increase and an upgrading of salaries that start at \$1,700 a year and reach \$3,000 after 26 years of service.

The bill deals with a highly complex classification of many thousands of workers who are responsible for the efficiency of our mail deliveries. In the salary brackets just mentioned are mostly carriers and clerks. The scale of pay proposed is naturally higher for postmasters, superintendents, engineers, and the like, and lower for others, but a proper proportion is maintained—at least to the degree that specific legislation can achieve it—and we should say that in no category do the figures seem excessive, and especially those quoted for letter carriers and postal clerks.

These are the post-office employees with whom the public comes more directly in contact and on whose conscience and intelligence it puts an intimate reliance. We think it will agree with us that they deserve, after 20 years, the modest raise and upgrading indicated—the more so that they may not strike for better wages but must depend on public sympathy and support for what should be coming to them.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of April 6, 1945]

THE NEGLECTED POSTMAN

Bills now pending in Congress are aimed toward tardy justice for a class of civil public employees that have long been neglected, the postmen. The measures would bring about a complete reclassification of postal employees. One would grant an immediate increase of \$400 a year, another would give time and a half for overtime work, while a third would confer seniority rights.

While these overworked, underpaid Federal employees have been neglected, the Government has been zealous in safeguarding the pay envelopes of the employees of private corporations.

Simple justice has long been due letter carriers and postal clerks, whose salary status has not been reclassified since 1925. If they stick to the job they attain a niggardly salary maximum at the end of 5 years. Beyond that their only hope of advancement in pay lies through elevation to a supervisorship or to the post of assistant postmaster.

The uninformed will be surprised to learn that the average pay of a postal clerk or carrier is \$2,000 plus a temporary bonus that gives a maximum of \$2,300. With deductions for income taxes and pension charges he is lucky if his net income is \$1,900.

There is an army of these employees and they have a national organization, which, however, has not concerned itself with stressing the need for salary recognition. No more faithful public servants exist than the postmen whose duties, though unobtrusive, are of the utmost importance and responsibility.

The postman's job is wholly devoid of glamor, yet if he for any reason were to cease to function business would immediately be disorganized and society in general would be put to it to carry on. The postman carries on regardless of heat or cold, faithful to the slogan of the service. He deserves better recognition than he has received.

[From the Minneapolis Times-Tribune of March 31, 1945]

POSTMAN'S PAY

Postal workers, described at a Senate hearing last year as "the most flagrantly underpaid group of employees in the United States," are still waiting for Congress to do something to better their lot.

A bill increasing their base pay for the first time since 1925 was passed unanimously by the House at the last session, but failed in the rush for adjournment in the Senate.

The temporary \$300-a-year increase granted in 1943 is due to expire in 2½ months, and the postmen fear they will soon be even worse off than at present.

One of the few objections raised to the bill in the last Congress was that it provided a blanket increase rather than graduated merit increases, which the Post Office Department had been planning for years.

Most legislators had lost patience with the post office delays in working out a new schedule and preferred to go ahead with their own bill, but now the official plan has been completed.

It has been embodied in a new bill, introduced by Representative THOMAS G. BURCH, of Virginia, chairman of the House Post Office Committee.

Since this measure has the approval of Government authorities, representatives of the employees and members of the committee, there seems no reason why it shouldn't be passed.

Yet vigilance on the part of the postman's friends in Congress will be required, to be sure that his bread and butter isn't lost in the shuffle again.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY CONGRESSMEN FOR POST PAY RAISE

WASHINGTON.—Some 150 Congressmen told the House Post Office Committee March 27 they wholeheartedly favor enactment of H. R. 2071 giving a \$400 yearly base-pay increase and time and a half for overtime to the Nation's postal employees.

President Leo E. George, of National Federation of Post Office Clerks (AFL), said the bill has the active backing of all AFL postal employee unions.

[From the Fargo Forum and Daily Tribune of April 15, 1945]

POSTAL PAY

Your postman and the other employees in the United States postal service are asking for your assistance. They are asking the folks they serve to help them get a raise in wages.

Should they have a raise in wages? They make out a strong case. Twenty years ago, under President Calvin Coolidge, the mailman's salary was raised from a maximum of \$1,800 to a maximum of \$2,100 annually. There has been no fixed increase in pay since.

They are now getting a temporary bonus of \$25 a month, but this \$300 a year will expire June 30 unless Congress extends it. Bills are pending before Congress that would grant the postman and all other postal employees a permanent \$400-a-year increase.

In view of the steep increase in living costs since 1925, a raise of \$33 a month would seem to be a fair and moderate request.

Postmen and other postal employees have homes to keep up, families to raise, children to educate.

Is there a more faithful public servant in America than your postman, who trudges to your door every weekday, rain or shine, sleet, storm, or blizzard, in the sizzling heat of summer and through the blasts of winter?

Recently the New York Daily Mirror made a plea for justice for the postman. Said the Mirror:

"Who is this postal worker whose income barely provides him with a worrisome subsistence? Is he one of the army of bureaucrats who infest Washington and the Nation to the number of 3,000,000?"

Everyone in America knows the answer to that one. These postal employees are true civil servants. They are not the pets of the New Deal. Compared to the compensation paid to employees in many of these new bureaucratic organizations, these old-time servants of the Government have been and are being shamefully treated.

Bills have been before Congress providing fair compensation for the postal employees for a long time. They were before the last Congress. It was generally agreed if the measures had come to a vote they would have passed. But at the last minute they were callously kicked out on a technicality.

The postman can do little about it. Their hands are tied. Under the Hatch Act they cannot mix in politics. They point out that they cannot strike, and wouldn't want to if they could. They have no recourse to arbitration, mediation, or negotiation.

All they can do is to appeal to the public to use its influence with Congress. If you think your postman and his fellow employees have a just cause, you could help by writing to some member of the North Dakota delegation in Washington and telling him how you feel about it.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of April 5, 1945]

POSTAL EMPLOYEES HAVE A CASE

Although it is a sound principle that salaries should not be permanently increased at a time when war prosperity has driven all prices high, the situation in which the postal employees of the Nation find themselves is considerable of an exception. They have not had a raise in 20 years. They almost received such a basic increase last year but through senatorial conflict over a technicality the bill was not passed.

Congress has recognized the fact of the higher cost of living and has in wartime authorized payment of a cost-of-living-bonus of \$300 a year. That bonus will expire on June 30 of this year. So, either of two things should happen. Either this bonus should be renewed or, better still, basic increase approved for the 70,000 postal workers.

The salary increase provided for in the pending legislation is \$400 a year. That may seem a considerable increase if it were not true that it represents deserved accumulated increases over a period of 20 years. No one probably would say that postal workers ever have been overpaid.

As can readily be imagined, obtaining authorization for basic salary increases for 70,000 Federal workers is not a simple matter in normal times. It appears not to have been a very easy matter even in war prosperity times. The workers are undoubtedly justified in pressing for a basic salary increase.

For the first time in many years of Post Office Department operation, it is now producing a surplus to the Government. During the last decade it has turned over to the Treasury more than \$117,000,000, despite the fact that one-eighth of the mail is carried free. This reflects the fact that the postal employees have been doing an increasing amount of work. For this and for reasons of seniority in service they deserve an increase in their compensation.

[From the Minneapolis Star-Journal of April 4, 1945]

HE DIDN'T GET THE RAISE

Remember the campaign last year to get postal employees a \$400 permanent increase in maximum pay, from the present basic limit of \$2,100? You may have the impression such a bill was passed. It went sailing through the House, but the Senate killed it the last day of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

A similar bill, H. R. 2071, is now before Congress. It provides the \$400 permanent raise, with \$100 a year extra for 2 years to compensate for added living costs. It also provides time and a half pay for overtime work. Postal workers now get 16 cents an hour less pay for overtime than they do for regular working hours.

The bill, however, hasn't moved out of committee. On June 30 the temporary bonus of \$300 a year expires, and unless action is taken the mailmen will go back to the scale which has been in effect for 20 years.

In 1932 each postal worker got a 30-day furlough without pay, and in 1933 he was given a 15-percent pay cut and a 9-day payless furlough. This on the basis that living costs had gone down. Except for the temporary \$300 bonus, no cognizance has been taken of increased living costs the past few years.

The Post Office Department expects to make \$117,000,000 this fiscal year. The men who pound the pavement and sort the mail and do all the kindred jobs so efficiently can't strike for higher pay. A grateful Nation certainly should set up a basic maximum pay goal of \$2,500 a year.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 16, 1945]

SIMPLE JUSTICE

Taken by and large, the employees of the United States Post Office Department render about as fine a public service as can be imagined. Most of us take employees and service more or less for granted, and do not fall "to gripe plenty," as the Army would say, when some little thing goes wrong. Consequently the whole country, through its Congress, has been guilty of serious neglect in the treatment of an outstanding branch of public servants. It has failed to recognize the fact that the heavily increased cost of living afflicts the post office people as much as it does miners, automobile workers, and others who again and again, because they were unionized, have forced pay increases beyond the power of white-collar groups to secure.

To be sure, the Congress several years ago passed belatedly a bill granting a salary increase of \$300 to the post office people, but by the terms of the bill this increase stops automatically June 30 of this year.

Now before the Congress is the Burch bill, which proposes a \$400 increase in postal employees' annual base pay with time and one-half for overtime, extra pay for night work, and some minor adjustments in compensation that are familiar to unionized labor generally, and have been familiar for years.

This bill ought to have prompt passage. The postal employees have not had an increase in base pay—except for the temporary wartime increase already referred to—since 1924. Anyone who can think back to that time, 20 years ago, will be able to imagine what unnecessary hardship this Government service imposes upon its people so unjustly. Relatively to what less skilled, less courteous, and less dependable workers receive in other callings, even that \$400 increase seems and is far less than adequate. But at least this bill is a "must" if the country has any conception of fair dealing.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle of April 12, 1945]

Members of Congress will have an opportunity soon to correct an apparent inequity that has existed for a long time when they are called upon to decide the fate of H. R. 2071, calling for a permanent salary increase for the Nation's postal workers.

Except for a temporary war bonus of \$300 a year granted in 1943, postal employees have had no raises in salary since January 1, 1925. And this \$300 honorarium is due to expire on June 30 this year. Unless action is taken soon by the House committee now studying the merits of a salary reclassification measure the workers face the prospect of returning to the pay basis in effect for 20 years.

Postal workers, just like the rest of us, are burdened with higher living costs and larger tax obligations now than in 1925. They struggled through the depression years without a complaint and have continued to give consistent good service during the war years when the wages of most other workers have mounted steadily.

It isn't that the department cannot afford to do better by its employees in a financial way. For many years the service was operated at a deficit. In 1935 there was a postal deficit of \$69,802,000. It is estimated that the current fiscal year 1945 will end with a postal surplus of \$117,643,897.

Therefore, in view of the circumstances we do not consider it more than right for Congress to recognize faithful service and enact H. R. 2071 without delay.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of April 11, 1945]

A JUST APPEAL

It is not often that one sees the American press generally agreed on a salary boost claim entered by any group. But that is the situation on the effort made by postal workers to get an increase through acceptance by Congress of the Burch bill, sponsored by the chairman of the House Post Office Committee. A similar bill passed the House in the closing day of the last session by an overwhelming vote but was not reached in the Senate before adjournment.

Reason for the solid support of newspapers and of all others interested enough to gather all the facts in the case lies in the discovery that there has been no pay increase for postal workers in exactly 20 years, or since the administration of Calvin Coolidge. During the depression they were called on to take a 27 percent pay cut. That was restored in 1935. In 1943 a temporary annual bonus of \$300 was voted them and half of that was promptly taken away by the operations of the withholding tax. The Burch bill would not only provide a \$400 flat increase but would provide for an upgrading of salaries starting at \$1,700 and reaching \$3,000 after 26 years of service.

The bill deals with a highly complex classification of many thousands of workers who are responsible for the efficiency of our mail deliveries. In the salary brackets just mentioned are mostly carriers and clerks. The scale of pay proposed is naturally higher for postmasters, superintendents, engineers, and the like and lower for others, but a proper proportion is maintained, at least to the degree that specific legislation can achieve it. And we should say that in no category do the figures seem excessive, and specially those quoted for letter carriers and postal clerks.

These are the postoffice employees with whom the public comes more directly in contact and on whose conscience and intelligence it puts an intimate reliance. We think it will agree with us that they deserve, after 20 years, the modest raise and upgrading indicated, the more so that they may not strike

for better wages but must depend on public sympathy and support for what should be coming to them.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

POSTMEN'S PAY

If your mail from the western front or the Pacific is overdue, you may be sure it is not your postman's fault. He is working long hours and carrying extra heavy loads to bring your letters as promptly as two sturdy feet and two willing hands can. There is something, however, that is long overdue the postman—a pay increase—and the public may be at fault in not giving sufficient support to his efforts to attain it.

Letter carriers and other post-office employees have had no increase in their annual base pay since 1925, despite the marked rise in the cost of living and repeated attempts to get remedial legislation passed.

Two years ago an annual bonus was granted, but it was only temporary and will expire in June. In 1944 a bill passed by the House was rejected in the Senate largely on a complaint that it granted uniform increases regardless of merit, but in that same year over-all increases were granted large groups of workers in private employ.

The pay of postal employees never has been too high. Under present conditions they decidedly are underpaid. The Burch bill now before Congress seeks to right this injustice. It deserves the support of both Congress and public, on whom the postal workers must depend in the absence of union organization to support their claims.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hart	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Pepper
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McKellar	Tobey
Capper	McMahon	Tunnell
Chavez	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Wilson
George	Murdock	
Gerry	Myers	

Mr. WHITE. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] for a brief while this afternoon. He is in attendance upon public business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from

Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent in Europe visiting battlefields.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on account of a death in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent in Europe on official business for the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are absent on official business of the Senate as members of a subcommittee of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate for a period of 2 hours and 30 minutes on some important public business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

AMERICA TOMORROW

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, D-day is here for building international stability. International stability is a world-wide necessity. International stability is also a domestic necessity for America tomorrow. It is a domestic necessity for every nation if its civilization is to survive, to say nothing of advance.

We who are at home owe it to our young men and women at the front to make sure that their complete and costly victory on both sides of the world shall be worth the infinite price paid for it. To do this we must do everything possible to establish and maintain such a just and lasting peace that when they return from the front they shall find here the America of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

It is time, therefore, for us, as Members of the United States Senate, to review the result to date of the efforts of the Allies to establish unity among the peace-loving nations of the world for purposes of peace as well as for those of war. In the Senate we have an especial responsibility to prepare ourselves for the early consideration of the Charter of the United Nations now being written at San Francisco and soon to be submitted to us as a treaty. It was with such a possibility in mind that the Senate, on November 5, 1943, adopted Senate Resolution 192 looking toward the formation, at the earliest practicable date, of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

In considering this Charter of the United Nations now, it is important not only to examine its terms; it is important also to see the whole Charter in its true perspective so that we shall neither underestimate nor overestimate its importance to America and to the world in attaining that international stability which is so essential to postwar recovery here and abroad.

Mr. President, unless we clearly see the need for the establishment of some general international organization at the earliest practicable date, we may easily underestimate the vital importance to America and to the survival of civilization of our reaching some agreement upon this issue at once. Unless we fully appreciate the tragic alternative of ever-threatening war which will face America and the world in the absence of such an agreement, we may be inclined to reject a charter because of its failure in some relatively unimportant particular to conform to our views.

If we are convinced, as I am convinced, that some charter establishing a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is essential to the survival and development of America and the world, we shall strive for a charter which shall conform as far as possible to our wishes. Before we would reject a charter in its entirety we should make sure that its defects are so gross that they would create a condition which would be worse for us and for our children and for the world than that which would result from the total absence of a charter with all the danger that a reliance upon the international law of the jungle involving the survival of the strongest in a state of perpetual warfare, would mean to America.

On the other hand, we must not overestimate the contribution which a mere international mechanism can make to the lasting peace of the world. We must not exaggerate either its scope or its force. We must place it in its true perspective and turn our attention likewise to such other actions as we should take to preserve our Nation and to attain our ideals.

Accordingly, in reviewing the situation presented by the Charter of the United Nations which has been developing at San Francisco, I shall discuss: First, the necessity for international stability; second, the wisdom of the approval of the proposed Charter of the United Nations;

third, the necessity for other action, in addition to the approval of the Charter of the United Nations if such approval be given.

I. THE NECESSITY FOR INTERNATIONAL STABILITY

Without international stability there can be no substantial prospect of domestic recover in the United States or any other nation. Without reasonable assurance of continued peace there is no peace. Temporary absence of war when coupled with fear or apprehension of war is but an armistice.

To the extent that there is fear of war there must be preparation for war. Therefore, in proportion to the need for such preparation, the strength and thought of men will be diverted from the constructive paths of peace to the destructive ways of war. Just to that extent will peace and prosperity be handicapped.

INTERNATIONAL STABILITY IS A WORLD-WIDE NECESSITY

International stability and reasonable assurance of international stability through some form of international commitment or organization is therefore essential. While it must be admitted that there can be no such thing as an absolute human guaranty that there will not be another and greater world war than that through which we are passing, yet it is equally clear that we owe the highest obligation that man can owe to those who have died in World War II to see to it that everything possible is done by us to make a World War III less likely than otherwise would be the case. It is obvious that much can be done to make such a war less likely. It is equally obvious that one of the primary things which can be done to this end is to develop some kind of an agreed procedure that will help to overcome the causes of war and to dispose of those incidents and frictions which otherwise might lead to war.

MIDDLE EAST PETROLEUM CAN AID WORLD RECOVERY

Perhaps I can make this point doubly clear by referring to a situation which was deeply impressed upon Senator TUNNELL, of Delaware, now presiding in the Senate, and myself when we visited the great petroleum resources on the Persian Gulf in January of this year. Traveling there on an official mission for the Senate, we were glad to see that—to the extent of existing pipe lines, refineries, and transportation facilities—these enormous resources were at that time being used to the fullest extent possible in support of the Allied cause in World War II. While the ascertainment of this fact was our primary mission, we were still more deeply impressed with the importance of these great resources to the future of the world. It was made clear to us through competent experts that the petroleum resources near the Persian Gulf in Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia are far greater than all the petroleum resources of the United States. Petroleum is one of the most valuable forms of wealth available to mankind in such an automotive age as the present. It is more important than gold. It holds the key to economic wealth, improved

standards of living, and even military power.

This particular accumulation of petroleum, furthermore, is located at a point where it will be tremendously needed in the generation of tomorrow. Situated near the juncture of Europe, Asia, and Africa, it is available to those continents at a time and in a manner greatly needed by the people of each of those continents. It may well be the key to their recovery and prosperity through the mechanization and development of their impoverished people. Senator TUNNELL and I also observed with especial satisfaction that this great resource was thus available to these people without the necessity for borrowing any part of it from the United States Treasury.

Accordingly, if for no other reason than the economic recovery of the world through the use of its own natural resources as exemplified through the petroleum supply of the Persian Gulf, it is in the interest of the United States and of the world to establish some kind of international stability which shall foster the early development of those resources and the distribution of their values to those who will use them partly for themselves and partly as purchasing power in dealing with the rest of the world.

USE OF MIDDLE EAST PETROLEUM WILL CONSERVE AMERICAN RESOURCES

This is not the only lesson which Senator TUNNELL and I learned from a study of these resources and their relation to the economic future of America and the world. It became clear to us, as it had been clear for many months to our GI soldiers and others in that area, that unless these great petroleum resources of the East were soon put to greater use than at present our own petroleum resources, if called upon to supply the needs, not only of the Americas, but of Europe, Asia, and Africa, would be exhausted comparatively soon, while the corresponding resources of Asia, Europe, and Africa would be conserved for future generations. It is clear that we of this generation owe an important obligation to our children and grandchildren to conserve the resources of America for their time as well as our own; and it is equally clear that one way to do this is to encourage the early and natural development of the petroleum resources of the Persian Gulf as a source of wealth for the rest of the world without exhausting the American resources for that purpose. This example supplies an important argument in favor of some form of international coordination of effort that will encourage the development of the natural resources of Europe, Asia, and Africa, as well as the Americas, in the present generation.

MIDDLE EAST PETROLEUM IS A TEMPTING MILITARY PRIZE

Still a third lesson was obvious to Senator TUNNELL and myself as we viewed the greatest petroleum refinery in the world at Abadan, near the southern extremity of Iran. In January of this year, these great refineries were devoted wholly to the military needs of the Allies. They were refining 300,000 barrels of petroleum a day and were soon to

be expanded to a capacity of 360,000 barrels a day. This tremendous output, however, made but a relatively small demand upon the resources available in the area. To the British troops quartered throughout southern Iran, to the Russians quartered throughout northern Iran, as well as the American troops transporting supplies from the south to the north to reach the eastern battle front through Russia, the potential military value of these petroleum resources in time of war was only too obvious.

If there is to be a World War III or if there is to be even a substantial prospect of a World War III, this tremendous petroleum resource is of such military value in the event of such a conflict that it would almost inevitably be a primary objective in such a war. Therefore, unless there be international stability and a reasonable assurance of international stability, this very petroleum resource itself may provide an occasion for hostile action in an attempt to secure some advantage through obtaining access to it. From a military standpoint this is an easy object lesson of the need for a general international organization of such stability and strength as to provide assurance against a World War III to such an extent that the military control of these petroleum resources shall not become a matter of international competition among the great nations of the world.

The foregoing are factual illustrations of the need for some form of general international organization to help assure international stability. They emphasize in a highly practical manner the need for such stability and point with all too great clarity to that unthinkable alternative of a World War III in the absence of some clearly understood international program dedicated to peace and security.

We need not, however, go beyond our own shores to see a demonstration of the need for international stability based upon our own conditions at home.

B. INTERNATIONAL STABILITY IS A DOMESTIC NECESSITY

International stability is a domestic necessity. It is a domestic necessity for America and for every nation of the world. I shall demonstrate its necessity for America.

When America seeks to establish a permanent, financially sound, peacetime prosperity after the war, it will do so under the greatest handicap in her history. It will do so under a greater handicap than anyone ever imagined America would face. I refer to our national debt. After this war it will be not merely twice or five times what it was after World War I, but it will be more than 10 times what it was after World War I. It will exceed \$300,000,000,000. Three hundred billion dollars can be translated into our personal experience by suggesting what it would mean if divided equally among the 30,000,000 families that make up the United States of America. Many of these 30,000,000 families already have mortgages upon the homes they occupy or rent. But whether or not they have such mortgages, the national debt of \$300,000,000,000, averaged among them, is equal to a \$10,000 mortgage ahead of

all other individual obligations now on their homes.

Furthermore this \$300,000,000,000, or these 30,000,000 \$10,000 mortgages, must be carried and kept in good standing. This national debt is evidenced by the bonds of the United States. These bonds must be kept good if there is to be any semblance of prosperity in America. These bonds are held by every trustee, insurance company, bank, business house, church, and practically every family in America. If anything were to happen to the stability and good standing of these bonds, the collapse of American credit and stability would be so great that our last depression would resemble prosperity in comparison with what we would then suffer.

In order for America to enjoy prosperity, in order that there may be Nation-wide employment in America, these bonds must be kept good. This means, at the least, that the interest on them amounting, at 2 percent per annum, roughly to \$6,000,000,000 a year, must be paid.

The interest on these bonds can come only from taxation. The necessary taxes to pay this interest and also to carry on our Government will be far greater than the taxes paid by the American people before the war. If such taxes are to be paid, the American people must, therefore, earn and produce much more real wealth than they earned or produced before the war. It is not necessary that this production reach the wartime peaks, but it is necessary that it reach a point somewhere about one-half way between prewar production and those wartime peaks.

I have confidence that America can meet this test. I believe that if there be cooperation between industry, labor, and agriculture, coupled with reasonable Government leadership, America will meet this test. That such peacetime production is at least possible seems clear, because America is producing now products far in excess of what she produced before the war. We have the plants, we have the machinery, we have the skilled labor and the skilled supervision. We have access to the materials and we have the means of distribution. There is an almost unlimited demand at home and abroad. With our capacity to produce and with this need for our products, we should be able to meet the test, especially if we shall produce those many new products and use those many new materials and methods of production which have been developed during the past few years. A reconversion policy conducive to individual enterprise, in small businesses as well as large, will be an important factor.

I have been given added confidence in the availability of such new materials, methods, and products through a recent publication supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It is entitled "Wartime Technological Improvements." In 400 pages it lists some fourteen hundred improvements developed during 1942 and 1943. Without attempting to describe any of them or to list more than a few of them, I call attention to the following new materials,

new methods, and new products listed in that publication. Among the new materials are synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, plastics and other synthetics, plywood, magnesium, great new quantities of aluminum, national emergency steels, and alloying elements. Among the new methods listed are riveting, welding and stitching metals, new heat-treating processes, metal spinning, powder metallurgy, centrifugal casting, continuous casting, metal spraying, mechanical inspections, electronic sorting, counting and measuring; and among the new products are aircraft designs and navigation devices, jet-propelled aircraft, improved automobile transmission and cooling systems, radar, television, radio and telephonic improvements, processed foods, new medicines, and electron microscopes.

These are but a few samples of materials, methods, and products that can represent improved standards of living and billions of dollars of increased value to be derived from human effort for the enjoyment of all and to which our young men and women who have won this war look forward with confidence.

This picture of possible prosperity, this means of meeting our national handicap derived from World War II, is, however, directly dependent upon one condition. This is that there shall be international stability and reasonable assurance of international stability for a substantial number of years ahead. If there be no such stability, it will not be possible for us to recall our men from ways of war to paths of peace. It will not be possible for us to divert the needed materials from destructive to constructive purposes, and it will not be possible to attract the investments of the future into those new enterprises which require several years of experimentation and development in order for them to produce the results upon which our prosperity shall depend.

It is for these reasons that international stability is a domestic necessity if America is to experience prosperity in time of peace. For similar reasons, international stability is a domestic necessity for every nation. In reverse, it is also true that domestic prosperity in America and elsewhere is essential to the maintenance of international stability.

Our first duty therefore is to seek reasonable roads to international stability. International stability by its very terms implies international understanding, tolerance, justice, and practical procedures for disposing of frictions among people and nations. It calls for some form of international agreement among the peoples of the world. The stronger and closer this agreement shall be, the greater the international stability that will result. The weaker that it shall be, the nearer the result approaches the uncontrolled law of the jungle under which survival depends upon force and war, rather than upon justice and peace. We seek the middle ground which will combine the greatest possible degree of individual freedom with that degree of mutual support which will assure safety against aggression and will attain justice through peaceful procedure in cases of international conflicts of interest.

It is a source of infinite encouragement to the peace-loving people of the world, and especially to the people of America, that the economic and military necessities of our time thus point the way toward policies of international understanding and agreement which are thoroughly in line with the ideals upon which our Nation is founded. To the extent that we shall thus proceed toward international understanding and agreement, we shall also proceed toward the practice of the Golden Rule, and toward a realization of the general principles of the brotherhood of man.

C. SENATE RESOLUTION 192, ADOPTED NOVEMBER 5, 1943

It was with an appreciation of this combination of the practical and the ideal that the Senate faced this fundamental issue when considering the advisability of a declaration of policy in 1943. The same issue was faced at the same time by the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China, who were about to join in the Declaration of Moscow.

Members of the Senate will recall that at the time when the Senate had before it the Connally resolution, Senate Resolution 192, dealing with this subject of international peace and security, there was announced to the world the declaration signed on behalf of those four nations on October 30, 1943, and forthwith the United States Senate incorporated the terms of that declaration into a paragraph of Senate Resolution 192. The Senate then adopted that resolution by a vote of 85 to 5. The policy thus declared by the United States Senate by a vote far exceeding two-thirds of the Senators present, served to advise the President of the United States, the people of the United States, and our allies of the importance which we attached to international stability and to the four foundation stones of America's policy in building that stability.

Through that resolution of 1943 the policy of the United States was as clearly declared and determined as it is possible for such a policy to be declared and determined under our form of government. It was set forth in a resolution of the United States Senate, which was adopted by an overwhelming vote. The policy was in the very words of a declaration just made on behalf of the Chief Executive of the United States and the Chief Executives of Great Britain, Russia, and China to the same effect. The conferences later held at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington and the present Conference at San Francisco have been undertaken by the representatives of the United States, therefore, not for the purpose of determining our policy upon the fundamental question of the advisability of our entry into a general international organization, but merely upon the question of implementing that policy and determining what specific terms should be agreed upon between the parties to such an organization as a basis for its formation.

It is important to bear this sequence in mind, because it is obvious that, if the present proposals are rejected, any future program for implementing this pol-

icy must necessarily pass through a procedure similar to that already taken at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco. There are probably hundreds of forms of agreements that would come within the four general purposes of the policy declared. In order, however, to make that policy a living policy some one form of agreement must be accepted by the parties, and unless dictated by one party to the others it must represent the result of various compromises among them. To abandon the present proposals in favor of some substantially different proposal at this time would be futile. Any such new proposal would in turn have to go through a new set of preliminary conferences. These would be comparable to the Dumbarton Oaks conferences, and under the circumstances the result probably would much resemble the original product of those conferences.

We shall do well, therefore, when we appraise the results of the San Francisco Conference to do so first from the point of view of determining whether it comes squarely within the general policy declared by the Senate in 1943; and if so, whether it represents the highest common factor of agreement among the 50 states which are parties to the San Francisco Conference.

In the interests of international stability, peace, and prosperity, it is our obligation to those who have given their lives that this Nation may live, to bring forth from San Francisco some agreement that shall be consistent with the declaration of 1943, an agreement which shall represent a step toward international stability rather than a step away from it. We must also examine the San Francisco proposals carefully and understand them clearly so that we shall neither exaggerate their contribution toward international stability nor deprecate their every contribution toward maintaining peace and security in the world as contrasted with the result which the world would face with no agreement.

The test established by Senate Resolution 192 is as follows:

The Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It is important to examine the four cornerstones of stability established in this declaration.

THE FOUR CORNERSTONES SET BY THE SENATE

First. The resolution calls for a general international organization. This distinguishes this proposal from a proposal for a static treaty. This calls for a going concern, flexible enough to meet changing conditions, and representative enough to permit the members of it to have channels of contact with one another on the basis of justice and equality rather than of force alone. It is clear that the San Francisco Charter of the United Nations meets this test.

Second. The organization must be "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states." This makes it clear that the organization,

in the first instance, shall be open only to peace-loving states. This has been taken to mean the Allies against the Axis, but it implies that when other states are able to meet this test such other states shall be admitted to membership through appropriate action of the existing members. This clause also emphasizes the policy that member states shall be recognized as enjoying "sovereign equality." This is a principle familiar to the citizens of the 48 sovereign States of the United States of America. While each of our States is a sovereign State, each, for purposes of mutual benefit, has, nevertheless, by constitutional contract, limited its freedom of action. Furthermore, under the Constitution of the United States, while our sovereign States have retained equality of representation in the United States Senate, they have agreed to a substantial difference in their representation in the coordinate legislative body—the United States House of Representatives. To a nearly corresponding degree the States have also accepted differences of representation in the electoral college which determine the degree of their influence in the choice of the President of the United States. The proposed San Francisco Charter of the United Nations clearly recognizes the principle of the sovereign equality of the original members, although in some degree limiting their absolute freedom of action in consideration of mutual advantages to be derived by the respective states from such contracts. The proposed charter therefore meets this second test.

Third. Open to membership by all such states, large and small. This expresses the fundamental policy of the relationship between individuals and between nations upon which our Nation was founded. From July 4, 1776, to the present we have sought to recognize equality of opportunity for individuals and states based upon their common relationship to God and to their fellow men rather than upon the basis of their size, strength, wealth, color, creed, or other man-made distinctions. The proposed San Francisco Charter of the United Nations meets this test.

Fourth. The purpose of the organization called for by the Senate is a limited purpose—"the maintenance of international peace and security." It does not require a supergovernment. It does not even require an administrative body. It calls for an organization to maintain international peace and security. If the United Nations shall succeed in the maintenance of international peace and security they will make a tremendous contribution to humanity. The question, therefore, is whether or not the charter presents a reasonable proposal for an organization to maintain international peace and security and approximates the highest common factor of agreement possible for that purpose among the initial members of the organization. I believe that the proposed San Francisco Charter of the United Nations meets this test as will appear from a further discussion of its terms. I believe, therefore, that the proposed Charter comes within all four requirements of the Senate resolution.

II. THE WISDOM OF THE APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Before considering the terms of the proposed Charter of the United Nations, I wish to express my appreciation of the long and difficult service which the members of the United States delegation to San Francisco, including the Secretary of State, E. R. Stettinius, Senator Tom Connally, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Representative Sol Bloom, Representative Charles A. Eaton, Commander Harold E. Stassen, and Dean V. C. Gildersleeve have been rendering to the United States and to the general cause of international stability.

Their patient, vigorous, constructive service has been evident from many public and personal reports of the Conference. They have also expressed their appreciation of the helpfulness to them of their professional staff and of the many voluntary consultants who have assisted them in the consideration of specific issues.

Many amendments to the original Dumbarton Oaks Proposals are still under consideration. None has been finally and officially adopted by the Conference. Yet many amendments have reached such a stage of informal agreement as to have justified their publication in the public press with the assurance that they give a fair indication of the probable form of the final agreement. There also have been published in the Department of State Bulletin for May 6, 1945, the several amendments in which the four sponsors had reached an agreement and which, accordingly, were presented as joint proposals and generally were received with favor.

Judging from these reported amendments, the original Dumbarton Oaks Proposals have been greatly strengthened and broadened so that if the original Dumbarton Oaks Proposals were regarded with favor, the amended instrument would seem to be entitled to a greatly strengthened support. I believe that each of the amendments announced has improved the proposals from the point of view of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as exhibit A, at the close of my statement, a copy of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals in their original official form, and immediately following that text I ask that there be printed in full, with several corrections that I have made in it with the assistance of the Department of State, the so-called text of the almost completed Charter of the New World Security Organization, as compiled by the staffs of the New York Times and the San Francisco Chronicle and published in the New York Times on Sunday, June 10, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Without objection, the request of the Senator from Ohio is granted.

(See exhibit A following Mr. BURTON's address.)

Mr. BURTON. I am especially anxious to establish the fact that the Charter of the United Nations as it is developing at San Francisco comes well within the

policy outlined for it by the Senate resolution of November 5, 1943, and I believe that is clear.

I wish also to commend the delegates of the United States upon the progress that has been made in improving the Charter as compared with the form in which the Charter originally was presented to them.

Finally by a review of important provisions of the Charter, I wish to emphasize the strength or weakness of those provisions and then to demonstrate the resulting value to the cause of international stability that is to be found in the proposed Charter.

The freedom of discussion, the outspoken differences of opinion among the representatives of 50 nations as reported at San Francisco have demonstrated to an unusual degree the genuineness of this conference. The presence of such discussions leading to ultimate constructive compromise has been a major triumph for democratic practice in arriving at settlements of international differences. This augurs well for the future of the Charter. It promises to be an "open covenant openly arrived at."

In considering the fundamental wisdom of approving the Charter of the United Nations, it is of primary importance to contrast its terms with the bald alternative of having no charter. Naturally, in reporting the development of the Charter through the negotiations at San Francisco, news interest has attached itself to the comparatively few points of disagreement rather than to the many points of agreement. This has tended to create an impression of the existence of major disagreement among the members of the conference. This is contrary to the fact.

The area of disagreement in fact has been reduced to an extremely small range, while the area of agreement has covered many items much more important than those on which disagreement has remained. Without here attempting to examine the whole Charter in detail, it nevertheless is important to emphasize at least five features of it. These are:

- A. Its methods of peaceful adjustment of disputes.
- B. The International Court of Justice.
- C. The Economic and Social Council.
- D. Regional arrangements and agencies.
- E. The Security Council.

A. ITS METHODS OF PEACEFUL ADJUSTMENT OF DISPUTES

The genius of this Charter is not the use of military force but the substitution of justice for force. This was excellently stated by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in Detroit, on February 5, 1945. He said:

The genius of Dumbarton Oaks, in correct perspective, is not the use of military force at all. The genius of Dumbarton Oaks is the exact opposite. It is the substitution of justice for force. It is the substitution of international law for piracy. It is the substitution of peace for war. Its genius lies in the organization of these pacific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. Its genius lies in the mobilization of the vigilant moral and

spiritual power of enlightened civilization against the dark and evil forces of recurrent savagery. If this power has been dormant and impotent, it is because it has lacked a vigorous world instrument for organized expression. In my deep conviction, Dumbarton Oaks, in proper form, can supply this tremendous instrument.

He was referring to the original Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, and those proposals insofar as they provide for pacific mechanisms to stop future frictions short of the necessity for force have not been limited but have been made more effective by the amendments which have been developed at San Francisco. It is important to remember this sentence from the statement by Senator VANDENBERG:

Its genius lies in the organization of . . . pacific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force.

This is the great objective of the Charter of the United Nations. Its purpose is to maintain peace and security, and its greatest contribution to that end consists of the several mechanisms established and extending from peaceful investigations to the use of economic or military force. None of these mechanisms would be available were it not for the Charter. They constitute an unanswerable reason for its ratification and against its rejection.

Among these pacific mechanisms, each one of which adds to the value of the United Nations Charter, should be listed at least the following:

First. The declaration of purposes: This will include increased emphasis, added at San Francisco, upon the principles of justice and international law, the recognition of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex. Under this heading, I quote from revised chapter I on purposes in its latest available form:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which may lead to a breach of the peace.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international problems of economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian character and promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex; and

4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

Second. The declaration of principles intended to carry out the purposes of chapter I is of extreme importance. Among these special emphasis may be

placed upon Nos. 3, 4, and 6 which are as follows:

(3) All members of the organization shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice are not endangered.

(4) All members of the organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any member or state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization

(6) All members of the organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the organization.

The entire chapter II dealing with principles in the form indicated by the latest report of the San Francisco meetings is as follows:

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in chapter I the organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

2. All members of the organization shall fulfill the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the organization.

3. All members of the organization shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice are not endangered.

4. All members of the organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any member or state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the organization.

5. All members of the organization shall give every assistance to the organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

6. All members of the organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the organization.

7. The organization shall ensure that states not members of the organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

8. Nothing contained in this Charter shall authorize the organization to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under this Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of chapter VIII, section B. (Such section relates to threats to the peace or acts of aggression.)

Third. The General Assembly: It provides for a general assembly of which all members of the organization shall be members. This extremely important but comparatively little discussed body shall meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as the occasion may require. It shall adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its own president for each session. It shall set up such bodies and agencies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions. Each member of the organization shall have one vote in the General Assembly. Important decisions of the

General Assembly including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, election of members of the Security Council, election of members of the Economic and Social Council, admission of members, suspension of the rights and privileges of members and budgetary questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions the decisions of the General Assembly shall be by a simple majority vote.

Fourth. The functions and powers of the General Assembly: In addition to its highly democratic form of organization just described, the General Assembly has certain functions and powers tending to stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. The General Assembly, for example, shall have the right to discuss any matter within the sphere of international relations and with certain limitations to make recommendations to any member or to the Security Council or both on any matters within the entire sphere of international relations. It shall have the right to consider and make recommendations on the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, expressly including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments. The General Assembly shall have the right to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the organization or by the Security Council. It also has the right to make recommendations with regard to any of the principles or questions above-mentioned. The limitations on these functions and powers mentioned above are that any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion and that while the Security Council is exercising, in respect of any dispute or situation, the functions assigned to it, the General Assembly should not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests. Nevertheless, the opportunity for discussion and recommendation among all members of the Assembly, even subject to the limitations stated, is of major importance as a peaceful method of procedure as to issues which might lead to international friction or conflict.

Fifth. The initiation of studies and making of recommendations: The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in the political, economic, social, cultural, educational and health fields assisting in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.

Mr. President, I wish to call special attention to this right and obligation of the General Assembly, in which each of the 50 members is represented by an equal vote, to encourage the progressive development of international law and its codification. Chapters III, IV, and V of

the proposed Charter in accordance with the latest proposals announced at San Francisco apparently are as follows:

CHAPTER III. MEMBERSHIP

1. The initial members are the signatories of the charter whose ratification has become effective in accordance with chapter XI.
2. Membership of the organization is open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the organization, are able and ready to accept and carry out the obligations contained in the charter.

CHAPTER IV. PRINCIPAL ORGANS

1. The organization has as its principal organs:

- A. A General Assembly;
- B. A Security Council;
- C. An Economic and Social Council;
- D. An International Court of Justice; and
- E. A Secretariat.

2. The organization should have such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary.

3. The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs.

CHAPTER V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SECTION A. COMPOSITION

The General Assembly shall consist of representatives of members of the organization. Each member may have not more than five representatives.

SECTION B. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS

1. The General Assembly shall have the right to discuss any matter within the sphere of international relations; and, subject to the exception embodied in paragraph 2 below, to make recommendations to the members of the organization or to the Security Council, or both, on any such matters.

2. In particular and without limiting the generality of the preceding paragraph, the General Assembly shall have the right:

A. To consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and to make recommendations to the governments or to the Security Council on such principles.

B. To discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the organization or by the Security Council, and to make recommendations to the governments or to the Security Council, or both, with regard to any such question. Any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion. The General Assembly shall have the right to call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security. While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it under this charter, the General Assembly should not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests. The secretary general shall be required, with the consent of the Security Council, to notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace or security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and also to notify the General Assembly immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

3. The General Assembly may admit new members to the organization upon recommendation of the Security Council.

4. The organization may at any time suspend from the exercise of the rights or privi-

leges of membership any member of the organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council, or which shall have violated the principles of the charter in a grave and persistent fashion. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored in accordance with the procedure laid down in chapter —, paragraph —.

5. The General Assembly shall elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council and the members of the Economic and Social Council. It shall elect the secretary general of the organization upon the recommendation of the Security Council, made by an affirmative vote of seven members. The General Assembly shall participate in the election of the judges of the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the court.

6. The General Assembly shall apportion the expenses among the members of the organization, it shall consider and approve the budgets of the organization as well as any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies brought into relationship with the organization under the provisions of chapter IX, section B.

7. The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in the political, economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, assisting in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex, and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.

8. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this section, the General Assembly should be empowered to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situations, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the purposes and principles set forth in this charter.

9. The General Assembly should make recommendations for the coordination of the policies of international economic, social, cultural, health, and other specialized agencies brought into relation with the organization in accordance with agreements between such agencies and the organization.

10. The General Assembly should examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned.

11. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; such reports should include an account of the measures which the Security Council has adopted or applied to maintain international peace and security.

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of this section, the General Assembly should be empowered:

(A) To approve or disapprove in whole or in part any report from the Security Council and to make any recommendations or observations thereon;

(B) To submit recommendations to the Security Council with a view to insuring complete observance of the duties of the Security Council inherent in its responsibilities to maintain international peace and security.

The General Assembly shall receive and consider reports from the other bodies of the organization and make any recommendations or observations thereon.

SECTION C. VOTING

1. Each member of the organization shall have one vote in the General Assembly. A member which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the organization shall have no vote so long as its

arrears amount to its contributions for two full years. The General Assembly may waive the penalty if it is satisfied that the reasons for delay in payment are beyond control of the state in question.

2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, election of members of the Security Council, election of members of the Economic and Social Council, admission of members, suspension of the rights and privileges of members and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. The General Assembly shall decide by a majority of those present and voting all other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority.

SECTION D. PROCEDURE

1. The General Assembly shall meet in a regular annual session and in such special sessions as occasion may require. Special sessions shall be convened by the secretary general at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the members of the organization.

2. The General Assembly shall adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its president for each session.

3. The General Assembly may set up such bodies and agencies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Sixth. Pacific settlement of disputes: In addition to procedure for the pacific settlement of disputes under the guidance of the General Assembly or the Security Council there are also certain pacific procedures which can and should be taken by individual states apart from action of the General Assembly or the Security Council. These are important. They include an express provision that any state, whether a member of the organization or not, may bring to the attention of the General Assembly or of the Security Council any dispute or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute.

I wish to call special attention to the fact that there is a specific provision that any state, whether a member of the organization or not, may bring to the attention of the General Assembly or of the Security Council any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction, or give rise to a dispute—an organized international forum open to the world. It is also provided that the parties to any dispute, the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves—and they do so obligate themselves by their membership—first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice. These provisions are contained in section A, chapter VIII, dealing with arrangements for the maintenance of international peace and security including prevention and suppression of aggression.

Seventh. Other peaceful procedures: If, nevertheless, parties to a dispute that is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security fail to settle it by the means just stated, they should obligate themselves to refer it to the Security Council. If the Security Council finds that the continuance of the

particular dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment, or itself to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

The extreme importance of these provisions often has been overlooked in public discussions of the Charter. In these cases the members of the Security Council, whether they be permanent or temporary members, are not permitted to vote or to veto if they are themselves parties to the dispute. This thus provides a mechanism which may be used in many cases and which will supply a forum of the greatest importance. Before resort is had to economic or military force the Security Council may itself recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment or even terms of settlement. This is a mechanism of peace heretofore lacking. It should help to secure fair settlements without the use of force. If these terms of peaceful settlement be not accepted and even if there be a subsequent veto of the use of the armed forces of the United Nations to meet the issue, this declaration of policy by the members of the Security Council, not parties to the dispute, will have a substantial bearing upon the alignment of the nations of the world in their individual capacities in the event of threatened hostilities beyond the control of the United Nations as such.

B. THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

There is to be an International Court of Justice and all members of the United Nations, by virtue of that membership, shall be parties to the statute of the International Court. While the statute relating to this Court has not been put in final form, it is expected to follow as closely as possible in form, precedent, and tradition, the statute of the present Permanent Court of International Justice which has been in existence since 1920. This new Court will be an important mechanism for the disposition of many questions without resort to force. Its jurisdiction like that of the present Court may well comprise all matters specially provided for in treaties and conventions. This jurisdiction will be capable of extension to many matters through the consent of the respondent to the jurisdiction of the Court in any particular case. The decision to set up a new Court instead of incorporating the old Court into the new organization was probably due in large part to the fact that the membership of the old Court included eight enemy states and five neutral states in World War II, while failing to include 13 probable members of the United Nations. Among those not included in the old World Court was the United States. The new Court will start with membership on the part of all of the United Nations as soon as they have become members of that general organization, and it will be open to membership by additional states as rapidly as they shall qualify for membership among the United Nations. It is an important agency of peace. Its incorporation in the Charter of the United Nations is an important reason for the ratification rather than the rejection of

that Charter in the interests of international stability.

C. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The Economic and Social Council is a new pacific mechanism which carries with it great possibilities for the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security. It provides an orderly and peaceful procedure for the consideration of the vitally important international questions of an economic and social nature.

Mr. President, this Council deserves more public recognition than has been given to it. While not listed in the original draft as one of the so-called principal organs of the United Nations corresponding to the General Assembly and Security Council, International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat, it is now so listed in the latest reports and it is given such a place of prominence in chapter IX, dealing with arrangements for international cooperation, that it is clearly of major importance. This Council may grow to a position of extraordinary influence and value in the maintenance of the peace and security of the world, because it reaches to the causes of war and conflict.

Its breadth of jurisdiction and its distinctly democratic organization and voting procedure make it an agency readily capable of rapid growth and great future influence.

Its original purposes expressly extended to economic and social questions, including other humanitarian problems. Amendments to chapter IX which seem likely to be adopted further expand its scope. The amendments which I shall read at this time are of extreme importance, because the Economic and Social Council has been so enlarged that it is quite different from the economic and social council set out in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. It represents one of the major contributions that has come from the many consultants who have been working with the United States delegates. These amendments include the following statement of purposes:

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the organization shall promote:

A. Higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

B. Solutions of international, economic, health, and other related problems; international, cultural, and educational cooperation; and

C. Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex.

Responsibility for the discharge of this function shall be vested in the general assembly, and, under the authority of the general assembly, in the economic and social council.

All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of these purposes.

By way of limitations, however, there is applicable here as elsewhere the previously quoted provision in the general principles of the charter that nothing contained in this charter shall authorize the organization to

intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the charter.

Mr. President, under the original proposals the Economic and Social Council is to consist of 18 members of the United Nations, each elected for a term of 3 years by the General Assembly. Each state elected to the Council shall have one representative who shall have 1 vote in the Council. Decisions of the Council shall be taken by simple majority vote of those present and voting. The amendments propose that the members shall be elected in 3 groups of 6 each for overlapping terms. They also expressly state that members shall be eligible for reelection at any time.

The Economic and Social Council thus provides for no permanent memberships, no special majority, and no individual right of veto. It is left to the good judgment of the General Assembly, by its two-thirds vote, to see to it that the five larger powers, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France shall be members of this Council by virtue of their natural fitness for such membership. It is probable that the other 13 members of the Council will include appropriate representatives of the middle and small powers, well distributed around the world. While this Council is an advisory and coordinating body rather than an executive council, a majority of but 10 states will be required to reach decisions and, therefore, in this fertile field of public policy there will be available to the world not only a meeting place but a forum and a voting procedure of high potential value, not necessarily controlled by one or even by all of the five larger states. This makes it necessary for the larger as well as the smaller states to sell their proposals to this Council on the intrinsic merit and fairness of their proposals. This Economic and Social Council has important potentialities the value of which will be great or small, depending upon the leadership shown by the sponsors of international peace, justice, freedom, and security.

The Council shall set up commissions in the fields of economic and social activities and for the promotion of human rights, and such other commissions as may be required in the fields within the competence of the Council. There shall be a permanent staff which shall constitute a part of the Secretariat. It will be equally important to see to it that this Council does not overdevelop its activities and to see to it that it makes reasonable and constructive use of them in the interest of international peace and security.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the provision for the creation by the Economic and Social Council of a commission on human rights was proposed by the United States delegation. It also has been suggested by the Secretary of State of the United States that one of the first tasks of this commission shall be to draw up an international bill of rights. It would then be for the United Nations to determine whether such a bill of rights should be made a part of international law or whether it should be left to the individual nations

to incorporate it in their respective constitutions. The United States delegation likewise proposed amendments authorizing the Economic and Social Council to make suitable arrangements for consultation with nongovernmental organizations, which are concerned with matters within the competence of the Council. Such arrangements may apply both to international organizations and, where appropriate, to national organizations after consultation with the member state concerned. This evidently was in the nature of an acknowledgment by the United States delegation of the indebtedness which it felt to its own consultants, representing some 42 national private organizations, which have shown special initiative and helpfulness in connection with the consideration of many phases of the United Nations Charter. I understand that in addition to the 42 national private organizations officially thus recognized, there were present at least 170 more which also contributed to the consideration of these issues.

The full terms of chapter IX, which has been expanded to great length by recent amendments, dealing with the arrangements for international economic and social cooperation, including the latest proposed amendments, as compiled on June 9 are as follows:

SECTION A. PURPOSES

1. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the organization shall promote:

A. Higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

B. Solutions of international economic, social, health, and other related problems; international, cultural, and educational cooperation; and

C. Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex.

Responsibility for the discharge of this function shall be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council.

2. All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of these purposes.

SECTION B. RELATIONSHIPS

1. The various specialized intergovernmental organizations and agencies having wide international responsibilities in economic, social, and other related fields, as defined in their basic instrument, shall be brought into relationship with the organization on terms to be determined by agreement between the Economic and Social Council and the appropriate authorities of the specialized organizations of agencies subject to approval by the General Assembly.

2. The organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the nations concerned for the creation of any specialized organization or agency required for the accomplishment of the purpose set out above.

SECTION C. COUNCIL: COMPOSITION AND VOTING

The Economic and Social Council shall consist of representatives of 18 members of the organization. The states to be represented for this purpose shall be elected by the General Assembly. The terms of service of the

members shall be 3 years, but arrangements shall be made after the first election for six of the members chosen at that election, to retire after 1 year, and six after 2 years. Members shall be eligible for reelection at any time. Each member shall have one representative who shall have one vote. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council shall be taken by a simple majority of those present and voting.

SECTION D. FUNCTIONS AND POWERS OF THE COUNCIL

In addition to the functions enumerated elsewhere, the Economic and Social Council shall be empowered:

A. To carry out, within the scope of its functions, recommendations of the General Assembly;

B. To make recommendations, on its own initiative, for promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms;

C. To make and to initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, health, and other related matters, and to make recommendations, on its own initiative, on such matters to the General Assembly, to members of the organization, and to specialized organizations or agencies concerned;

D. To coordinate the activities of the economic, social, cultural, health, and other specialized organizations or agencies brought into relation with the organization, through consultation with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the members of the organization;

E. To obtain regular reports from the specialized organizations or agencies, to obtain reports from the members of the organization and from the specialized organizations or agencies on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations and to those of the General Assembly; and to communicate its observations on such reports to the general assembly;

F. To perform services at the request of members of the organization and at the request of specialized organizations or agencies with respect to economic, social, cultural, health, and other related matters, subject to the approval of the General Assembly;

G. To call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the organization, international conferences on matters falling within the scope of the functions of the Council;

H. To prepare draft conventions, with respect to matters falling within its competence, for submission to the General Assembly;

I. To furnish information to the Security Council;

J. To assist the Security Council upon its request; and

K. To perform such other functions within the general scope of its competence as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

SECTION E. ORGANIZATION

1. The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in the fields of economic and social activities and for the promotion of human rights, and such other commissions as may be required in the fields within the competence of the Council.

2. The Economic and Social Council shall invite any member of the organization to participate, without vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that member.

3. The Economic and Social Council may make arrangements for representatives of the specialized organizations or agencies brought into relationship with the organization to participate, without vote, in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it, and for its representatives to participate in the deliberations of such specialized organizations or agencies.

4. The Economic and Social Council shall be authorized to make suitable arrangements for consultation with nongovernmental organizations which are concerned with matters within the competence of the Council. Such arrangements may apply both to international organizations and, where appropriate, to national organizations after consultation with the member state concerned.

5. There shall be a permanent staff which shall constitute a part of the Secretariat of the organization.

6. The Economic and Social Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure and the method of selecting its president. The Economic and Social Council shall meet as required in accordance with rules adopted by the Council. These rules shall include provision for the calling of a meeting on the request of a majority of the members of the Council.

D. REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND AGENCIES

The recommendation and encouragement of regional arrangements and agencies which has been a part of the United Nations program from the first announcement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is another feature of major significance.

It constitutes a vitally important and realistic recognition of the practicalities of international relationships. It emphasizes the fact that while the whole world has become interdependent yet there are great numbers of questions and policies which have important local, national, or regional significance apart from the comparatively few issues that have important world-wide significance.

If we are to understand the conservative character of the United Nations Organization contemplated by the proposed charter, it is important to recognize the limited jurisdiction which it vests in the United Nations agencies. The United Nations organization is by no means an administrative body attempting to administer the affairs of the world as a unit. It is not a super-government. It is not an attempt to place a magnifying glass upon the national government of the United States of America or of any other nation and to impose that structure upon the world. It recognizes that the complexities of long distances, large populations, complicated industrial relations, and differences of language and historical point of view, emphasize the wisdom of a decentralization of administrative power. The British Empire has given the world an example of the wisdom of decentralization. Although united by ties of tradition, language, commercial relations, and otherwise, it recognized a number of years ago the advisability of decentralizing the Empire through the formation of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Through such decentralization it has gained rather than lost in its efficiency, strength, and durability.

The proposed Charter of the United Nations limits its fundamental purpose to the maintenance of international peace and security. It does not attempt to centralize governmental administration. It seeks to encourage and coordinate policies which will tend to maintain international peace and security. It seeks to bring about by peaceful means and with due regard for principles of justice and international law the adjustment and settlement of international

disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace.

It seeks also to strengthen the prospects for universal peace and international cooperation by eliminating, as far as possible, the fundamental causes of war.

Recognizing this limitation upon its activities in the manner described, the United Nations add great strength to their program by recognizing and encouraging regional arrangements and agencies to meet issues which are of an international nature but which are of local or regional scope rather than of global scope. It is in the interests of the peace, security, and stability of the world that national domestic questions be settled through national and domestic arrangements and agencies. It is similarly in the interests of such peace, security, and stability that as far as practicable regional issues be settled through regional arrangements and agencies. Such a policy tends to reduce the number of questions which shall so threaten the peace and security of the world that they shall require the use of global arrangements or agencies for their settlement.

The logic of this decentralization of responsibility is further emphasized by certain natural and traditional relationships in various regions. An outstanding example is found in the regional unity of the 21 republics in North, Central, and South America. The regional relationship has been evidenced by constantly increasing numbers of ties of varying degrees of formality culminating in that vitally important regional agreement recently entered into among them at Mexico City and known as the Act of Chapultepec. In connection with that act, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], whom I see present, was a great help. Also the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was a leader in bringing about that understanding.

The wisdom with which this general problem has been approached is emphasized by the fact that the Charter of the United Nations does not attempt to require the formation of regional agencies nor to prescribe their form. It merely recognizes and encourages them where they may naturally present themselves. The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals provided in section C of chapter VIII that nothing in the Charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the organization. Those original proposals further stated that the Security Council should encourage settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council. The latest proposals add that—

The member states comprising such agencies or entering into such arrangements should make every effort to achieve peaceful settlement of local disputes through such

agencies or arrangements before referring them to the Security Council.

The adjustment of relationships between regional agencies and the general international organization calls for careful consideration in each instance. The details of some of these adjustments have been much discussed, but there has been no departure from the sound public policy involved in the existence of such arrangements and calling for the development of some means of coordinating regional activities in each case with those of the general international organization.

To the extent that regional arrangements on the American Continent or on the European or any other continent can assume some of the primary responsibilities for the settlement of local disputes and for the maintenance of international peace and security, there is hereby gained an important step toward the maintenance of the peace of the world. The localizing of disputes and settlements for adjustment among those most closely related to them is a sound principle of governmental organization and of human relationships well deserving of encouragement. It is a natural application of the principle of self-government.

This recognition and encouragement of regional arrangements and agencies in the Charter of the United Nations is an important additional reason in favor of the ratification and against the rejection of that Charter.

While the final terms of chapter VIII, section C, and other parts of the Charter dealing with this subject have not been announced, the discussions have indicated that the original proposals for the Charter may well be expanded so as to clarify the relationships between the United Nations organization and at least two types of regional arrangements and agencies that already are recognizable.

For example, treaties designed to prevent future aggression by the enemy states of World War II may well be permitted to operate automatically as a practical measure of localizing the maintenance of peace and security in the immediate future. This recognition and encouragement of local and regional responsibility is in line with the policies already indicated, and may well continue until such time as the general international organization may, on request of the governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by a state now at war with the United Nations.

Similarly in the case of the regional security arrangements which have been developed in the Act of Chapultepec, or which may be developed through similar acts, it may well be recognized that the United Nations organization has full and final authority on questions relating to international peace and security, but that nothing in the Charter impairs the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense, if an armed attack occurs against a member state, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

The latest published version of chapter VIII, sections C and D, is of extreme importance in this particular, and in full is as follows:

SECTION C. REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Nothing in the Charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agents for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the organization. The member states comprising such agencies or entering into such arrangements should make every effort to achieve peaceful settlement of local disputes through such agencies or arrangements before referring them to the Security Council. The Security Council should encourage the development of peaceful settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

This paragraph in no way impairs the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of section A of this chapter.

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council with the exception of measures against enemy states in this war provided for pursuant to chapter XII, paragraph 2, or, in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of such states, until such time as the organization may, on request of the governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by a state now at war with the United Nations.

3. The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

SECTION D

Nothing in this Charter impairs the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member state, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under this Charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

E. THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council is the enforcing agency of the United Nations organization. It is also an executive agency through which various actions can be taken on behalf of the United Nations in the interest of the maintenance of peace and security without resorting to enforcement measures of either an economic or military nature.

Due to the fact that the enforcement features of such a charter as this are the most difficult of adjustment and definition, these naturally are the last ones upon which general agreement is reached. To some extent such an agreement has not yet been finally reached at San Francisco. However, substantial

agreement has been reached on so much that it is well worth consideration here.

It is important to recognize, however, that although these provisions for enforcement are essential for certain extreme emergencies and are valuable in helping to forestall such emergencies, yet they are not the features of the plan that will be called upon for use in most of its current operations. In fact, if the United Nations are thoroughly successful in their efforts to maintain international peace and security through peaceful means, those enforcement measures will not come into operation at all. Like flood-protection devices, there are some that are needed to meet regular and expected dangers. There are others that are built to meet extraordinary emergencies which it is hoped never will arise, and which when they do arise may be of such an unpredictable character that nothing could prevent the disaster they bring. We, therefore, build protective walls to meet foreseeable and extraordinary emergencies, and we should not be dissuaded from building them merely because it is conceivable that they may not withstand a major earthquake.

The attention given to the voting plan in the Security Council, especially on matters involving the use of armed force, emphasizes the fact that the voting relationships here called into operation present a new problem in governmental mechanics quite as difficult and quite as new as that which faced the members of our Constitutional Convention which in 1787 brought forth the new proposals contained in the Constitution of the United States. The very fact that the conditions are new indicates that the solution, if it is an appropriate one, will probably have some elements of experimentation in it.

In approaching this subject it is also important to recognize the nature of the armed forces that are involved. They represent, initially at least, the same armed strength of the Allied Nations which recently has won the war against the Axis nations in Europe, and much of which is still directed against the Axis forces under the control of Japan. The essence of the strength of these Allied forces was in their allied unity. They constitute a championship team. The championship was won by the entire team acting as a team, not by any one member of it alone. It is the purpose and intent of the Charter of the United Nations to preserve that team intact. It is upon the continued unity of that team that the demonstrated strength and military authority of the organization as an enforcing agency rest. It is, therefore, important to recognize that at all points in the consideration of this enforcement agency we are dealing with the agency as a unit. If the agency ceases to be a unit or if dissension arises among the members of the championship team, then the demonstrated ability of the agency to defend its championship against all comers and to assume responsibility for preserving order by force of arms loses its best claim to invincibility. In fact, the existence, to say

nothing of the strength, of this agency of the United Nations is conditioned upon the unity that creates it.

While this does not mean that disagreement among the major Allies necessarily spells war between them, or that each is unable to continue to fend for itself in the future, it does mean that when there is dissension among these major Allies the world is then deprived of its one greatest, most obvious, and most accessible source of demonstrated power to enforce international law and organized justice in the interests of humanity.

The whole theory of this enforcement provision is that the peace-loving nations of the world, identified at this time by their alliance in their defense of the world against the aggression of the Axis Nations, have decided to stand together in maintaining international peace and security.

Insofar as this enforcement section of the Charter is concerned, its strength and success therefore depend fundamentally upon the will of the United Nations, and primarily of the five larger United Nations, and of the peoples of those nations, to remain united and at peace with one another. There cannot be devised any governmental mechanism which can be the equivalent of an automatic pilot to guide the world unerringly along the paths of lasting peace. Mechanisms that will eliminate sources of friction are important aids to the maintenance of peace and security. Mechanisms to make decisions between nations based upon justice and law are important agencies of peace. But as long as governments are controlled by human beings those governments will respond to human impulses, and no mechanism can by itself eliminate that human factor. Accordingly, if we expect to achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace for generations to come, or even for a single generation, it must be our objective, and that of our allies, to so guide our conduct and our emotions that we shall genuinely try, in our international as in our personal affairs, to do unto others as we would have them do unto us. The practice of the Golden Rule, growing out of a deep faith in the common brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God, is needed as a foundation for a just and lasting peace.

There are two aspects to the work of the Security Council. The first is its function as a pacific mechanism seeking to preserve peace through peaceful methods. The second is its character as an enforcement agency, seeking to enforce peace by the exercise of economic or military power in behalf of the United Nations, much as the peace officers of our national, State and local governments keep the peace and enforce the law within their respective jurisdictions. The plan by which the votes of the members of the Security Council are cast in the discharge of these respective functions is also of special importance.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL AS A PACIFIC MECHANISM

While much emphasis, Mr. President, has been placed upon the function of the Security Council as the enforcement agency of the United Nations, that is by

no means its only function. It has many minor administrative functions in connection with the conduct of the peace of the United Nations organization. It also has an outstandingly important function as a pacific mechanism seeking to preserve the peace of the world without resort to military or economic sanctions. This phase of its activity has not been given the public attention that it deserves.

VOTING PROCEDURE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Before considering even this phase of its activities, it is essential to make clear the way in which the membership is determined and official decisions are made in the Security Council. The Council is to consist of 11 members. Six of the eleven are to be chosen from and by the General Assembly. These six member states are to be elected by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly for terms of 2 years, and three of the six will retire each year. In the first election three of the six shall be chosen for 1 year and three for 2 years. At no time shall any of such elected members be eligible for immediate reelection after the expiration of their respective terms. Due regard is to be paid in the first instance to equitable geographical distribution and to the contribution of members of the organization toward the maintenance of international peace and security, and toward the other purposes of the organization. The other members of the Security Council shall be representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and, in due course, France. These shall be permanent members, and, no doubt, membership to France will be extended at the initial formation of the organization.

On questions of procedure it is proposed, in accordance with the understanding reached at the Crimea Conference at Yalta, that decisions of the Security Council shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members. In fact, on all issues coming before the Security Council its action is to be taken by an affirmative vote of seven members, the only difference being that on some questions this affirmative vote must include some or all of the five permanent members of the Council.

The obvious reason for this majority of seven, rather than a simple majority of six, even on questions of procedure, is that it is important that on any decisions of the Council there be concurrence, not merely of the six temporary members or of the five permanent members, but there must be the concurrence of at least two of the temporary members with the five permanent members, or, at least, the concurrence of one of the permanent members with the six temporary members. Ordinarily, the combination will be on some other basis, but this provision at least requires the concurrence of some of the larger with some of the smaller nations before taking action on any issue. The soundness of this provision apparently has not been seriously questioned.

I wish to emphasize that whenever a variation occurs from a simple majority, as is the case here, it necessarily creates veto power in a minority. There has

been much discussion about the veto power to be exercised by individual members of the Security Council. Each of the five permanent members are given a veto power for certain purposes, as I shall discuss. It is important, however, also to realize that on every question any combination of five member nations, be they permanent or temporary, large or small, have a veto power over any action of the Security Council. The veto power does not lie alone in any one of the major nations. It lies also in any combination of five of the smaller nations, if they so wish to exercise it, because unless such five nations will break up sufficiently to permit one of them to vote with the other six, no action at all can be taken by the Security Council.

On questions other than those of procedure it is also required that the affirmative vote of seven must include all of the permanent members that are not parties to the dispute and in some cases it must include all permanent members even though they are parties to a dispute. This amounts in some cases to permitting a permanent member to have a veto over action of the Council when that permanent member is not a party to the dispute and in some cases even permits such a member to veto action when it is a party to the dispute.

The distinction between these classes of cases is important. There is a natural justification for the veto by a major power of the use of its forces against itself. There is little if any apparent justification of the veto in the case of recommendations of peaceful settlements. It is of substantial importance that there be no right of veto against a discussion of issues within the jurisdiction of the Council. Apparently this freedom of discussion is to be preserved.

In considering this right of veto it is important to recognize that we are discussing here only the right of veto of action by the Security Council. There is no right of veto by any single member of any decision by the General Assembly or by the International Court of Justice or by the Economic and Social Council. Nor is there a right of veto of decisions by the Security Council on questions of procedure or a right of veto of the mere discussion by that Council of any subject within its jurisdiction.

Furthermore, there is no right of veto by a party to the dispute, when the merits and peaceful settlement of that dispute are at issue, as distinguished from the case where the issue is the enforcement of a decision. This is the general effect of the provision which requires a party to a dispute to abstain from voting in decisions arising under section A of chapter VIII, which is the important section dealing with the pacific settlements of disputes. This complete exclusion from voting applies also to a party to a dispute in decisions under what in the final draft apparently will be the third sentence of paragraph 1 of section C of chapter VIII, which deals with the encouragement of settlement of disputes by regional arrangements or agencies.

Section A of chapter VIII thus becomes of special importance not only because of its own substance but because in mak-

ing decisions under it the right to vote—and therefore also the right to veto—is limited to members of the Council that are not parties to the dispute. The world is thereby assured of having a substantially disinterested and highly representative body in a position to recommend terms of settlement in disputes which otherwise might endanger the peace and security of the world.

Section A of chapter VIII has not yet been put in final form, but there is good reason to expect that it will read substantially as follows, including several amendments which have received favorable consideration:

SECTION A. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraphs 3-6 below, the Security Council should be empowered, if all the parties so request, to make recommendations to the parties to any dispute with a view to its settlement in accordance with the principles laid down in chapter II, paragraph 3.

2. The Security Council should be empowered to investigate any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

3. Any state, whether a member of the organization or not, may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the General Assembly or of the Security Council. In the case of a nonmember it should be required to accept, for the purposes of such dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the Charter.

4. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, should obligate themselves, first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice. The Security Council should call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

5. If, nevertheless, parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 4 above fail to settle it by means indicated in that paragraph, they should obligate themselves to refer it to the Security Council. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the particular dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under paragraph 6 or 7 or whether itself to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

6. The Security Council should be empowered, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 4 above, to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

7. Justiciable disputes should normally be referred to the International Court of Justice. The Security Council should be empowered to refer to the Court, for advice, legal questions connected with other disputes.

The entire third sentence of paragraph 1 of section C of chapter VIII in decisions under which parties to a dispute likewise have no right to vote or veto will probably read as follows:

The Security Council should encourage the development of peaceful settlement of local disputes through such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

While it is true that a veto power therefore still rests in such permanent members of the Security Council as are

not parties to the pending dispute where the action of the Council is seeking to bring about a pacific settlement of that dispute, nevertheless, such veto power is at least the veto power of a nation that is itself not a party to the issue and therefore is in a position to apply considerations of justice and fairness to the issue more readily than if it was itself a party to the dispute.

Mr. President, there is much to be said for omitting the veto power altogether in dealing with the pacific settlement of disputes or their reference to regional agencies. The very argument which leads to the requirement that a party to the dispute, be it a temporary member of the Council or a permanent member of the Council, shall abstain from voting on the peaceful settlement of a dispute to which it is a party argues for the elimination of the veto power altogether. For example, if a permanent member of the Council is thus deprived of its vote and of its veto in a case where it is itself a party to the dispute, there would seem to be still less ground for its insisting upon an individual veto power over the pacific settlement of a dispute to which it is not a party at all. Its vote in such a case where it is not a party would be appropriate, but the very fact that it is not a party would seem to indicate that a right of veto should not be accorded to it. Even though it may not now be possible to eliminate this right of veto of recommendations for pacific settlements, it may be possible, after a few years of experience under the Charter, to demonstrate the feasibility of such an elimination.

In the interest of securing an agreement on the Charter Russia recently abandoned its contention that the right of veto should extend to the vetoing of the discussion of a controversial issue by the Security Council. This action by Russia in abandoning such a contention was taken in response to the unanimous request of all of the other permanent members of the Council, and it is indicative of the kind of cooperation and mutual confidence that is essential to the success of the United Nations experiment. This agreement to the free discussion of issues is an important element in the program which depends primarily upon mutual and full understanding of issues for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The action of Russia in this instance gives some ground for hope that it and the other permanent members of the Security Council may at some time agree to waive the right of veto of any decision to recommend peaceful procedures and settlements, as distinguished, for example, from a veto of the enforcement of a decision by the use of the economic or armed forces of the nations called upon to do the enforcing.

The Security Council has an extraordinary opportunity to avoid unnecessary war by the exercise of its powers of investigation and of recommendations of peaceful procedures and settlements.

It is expressly provided in the proposed amendments of chapter VIII, section A, paragraph 4, that the parties to any dispute, the continuance of which

is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall obligate themselves, first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

Assuming, however, that such means have failed, there is provided a further important power on the part of the Security Council for the peaceful disposition of the dispute. This power is of substantial importance to the world and has not yet received adequate consideration in public discussions of the Charter. It is provided in paragraph 6 of the same section that the Security Council is to be empowered at any stage of a dispute of the nature above mentioned, which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment. This provision has been in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals from the beginning. It contains an important power to recommend appropriate methods of adjustment before resorting to force. One interpretation made of this provision has been to limit it strictly to procedures or methods of adjustment as distinguished from terms of settlement. On the other hand, a broader interpretation would indicate that appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment would include terms of settlement as a method of adjustment. However, the danger of such ambiguity is eliminated by the more recently published amendment which expressly provides in the revised form of paragraph 5 of this section that if the Security Council deems that the continuance of the particular dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under paragraph 6 or 7, theretofore mentioned, or whether itself to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

This amendment is of primary importance. It leaves no doubt as to the power of the Security Council by a vote of seven of its members, exclusive of any members that shall be parties to the dispute, to recommend to the world and to the parties appropriate terms of settlement of a dispute endangering the peace of the world.

This provision in itself is a substantial argument in favor of the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations and against its rejection. It provides an important mechanism for the peaceful settlement of disputes which otherwise might well lead to a World War III. Our generation owes it to future generations not to overlook such an opportunity as this for the maintenance of international peace and security.

As a further official explanation of the voting procedure in the Security Council, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record as exhibit B, following the two drafts of the Charter, a copy of the statement by the delegations of the four sponsoring governments on voting procedure in the Security Council as released at San Francisco, Calif., on June 8, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

THE SECURITY COUNCIL AS AN ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

Mr. BURTON. Now, Mr. President, turning to the other capacity in which the Security Council is authorized to act, we should consider its position as an enforcement agency. In this capacity, it assumes the duties of a sheriff. In order to assist it in the performance of these duties it is supplied with armed forces.

Its decision to act as an enforcing agency, either through the use of economic sanctions or of the armed forces supplied to it, requires an affirmative vote of seven of its members, and such seven must include the concurring vote of all of the permanent members whether or not they are parties to the dispute.

This gives a full veto power to each of the five permanent members of the Council, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France. They in turn are also the nations which will supply the major portions of the armed forces which would be used in military enforcement procedures. While there may be arguments against this veto power, yet, in view of the source of the armed forces to be supplied the Security Council, there are probably at the present time compelling arguments in favor of this veto power if limited to decisions on enforcement issues.

The use of such a veto power upon the issue of whether or not the Security Council shall use the armed forces of the United Nations presents quite a different question from the use of the veto power on a recommendation of terms of peaceful settlement. The armed forces of the United Nations are primarily those of the five permanent members of the Security Council itself. To call out these forces for use against one of the five permanent members would be much like calling upon the sheriff to arrest himself. The incongruity of such action is recognized in the statutes of our respective States. For example, it is frequently provided that in such an instance some other official of that State, for example, the coroner, shall exercise the authority of the sheriff. Here the difficulty is even greater. There are no substantial forces other than those of these permanent members which could possibly be used to apply armed force to the other permanent members. To make such an order would be an express order to start World War III, if the defendant physically resisted the enforcement of the decision against it. The veto right in such a case is, therefore, a straightforward way of recognizing the limitation of the powers of enforcement that are inherent in this Charter.

It is important that no nation under the Charter of the United Nations shall be called upon to perform an obligation which, when the time comes to perform it, it is likely to refuse to perform. It is quite likely that if a permanent member of the Security Council were, by the terms of the Charter, called upon to use its own

armed forces against itself, or even against another major power, it would decline to do so. Furthermore, if such a provision were incorporated in the instrument, it is altogether likely that the instrument shall fail of ratification by some of the nations most vitally concerned. It might lead to its failure of ratification by the United States itself.

Accordingly, the incorporation of this veto power to be exercised by anyone of the permanent members of the Security Council over the use of the armed forces of the United Nations is by no means a provision which would justify a refusal to ratify the instrument as a treaty. It might be suggested that the veto should be limited to the use of a nation's own quota of the armed forces of the United Nations, rather than to the use of any part or all of those forces. It apparently has been determined that such a contention at this time, however, would not be acceptable and therefore it should not be pressed.

Insofar as the United States is concerned, to say nothing of the other nations sponsoring the Charter, the presence of this veto power which permits the United States to veto the use of armed forces of the United Nations either against itself or against any other nation is a strong argument in favor of the special interests of the United States under the Charter.

To the extent that such a veto power cuts off the use of the armed forces of the United Nations at the option of any one of the permanent members of the Council, it is a limitation upon the United Nations as an enforcing agency. This limitation should be clearly recognized as such. We should then recur to the fact that this entire proposal depends upon the concurrence in it of at least five major allies as the foundation of its structure. Without this limitation it is clear that the consent of the five could not now be obtained and the Charter should not be rejected merely because it does not accomplish what is at the moment impossible, namely, the securing of the voluntary agreement of the five major nations to permit the use of the combined armed forces of those nations against themselves, or against others, without a final individual opportunity to veto such a use in the light of the conditions at that time.

It is to be hoped that disputes endangering the peace of the world will be adjusted before ever reaching such a crisis. The Charter is intended to make it as unlikely as possible that such a crisis will be reached.

But even with this veto power upon their use, the existence of the proposed armed forces of the United Nations, subject to the call of the Security Council, will provide an important added assurance of the possibility of maintaining the peace of the world. As against all except the five nations which hold a veto power over their use, these forces will be immediately available or readily on call in accordance with the terms of the Charter. They will constitute an effective peace force. They are an expression on the part of the great championship military team of the Allied Nations that that

team stands ready to enforce international law and justice throughout the world for the sake of the peace of the world and in accordance with the Allied Nations' demonstrated capacity to defend the world against aggression. Our sacrifices in World War II are sufficient reasons for our seeking in this added way to prevent the outbreak of World War III and to put an end to such a new war, if there should be one, while it is in such an early stage that this can be done with a minimum of further sacrifice.

By way of concrete example, another threatened invasion of Ethiopia by Italy, of Poland by Germany, or of Manchuria by Japan, under this Charter could and should be stopped at an early stage through the use of the armed forces of the United Nations under direction of the Security Council. However, in the absence of some such charter, some such mechanism of peace, and some such enforcing agency, a renewed attack of the kind which led to World War II might all too readily lead to World War III and our generation would be inexcusably to blame for having taken no constructive measures to prevent the recurrence of that tragedy. Accordingly, the powers of the Security Council coupled with the armed forces of the United Nations, although limited by the right of veto on the part of a permanent member of the Council, provides an important argument in favor of the ratification and against the rejection of the United Nations Charter as a step toward the maintenance of international peace and security.

In order that all members of the United Nations may actively help to maintain international peace and security in time of crisis and against aggressors, they undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including right of passage necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. These agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The agreements are to be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council and member states, or between the Security Council and groups of member states. All such agreements are to be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the United Nations, there are to be held immediately available by its members national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. There is also to be established a military staff committee. Its functions shall be to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, to the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, to the regulation of armaments and to possible disarmament. It shall be responsible under the

Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Council. The committee shall be composed of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the committee is to be invited by the committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the committee's responsibilities requires that such a state should participate in its work. The staff committee, with the authorization of the Council, after consultation with regional agencies, may also establish military subcommittees.

In substance, the armed forces of the United Nations are to be a smaller edition of the Allied armed forces mobilized and used in much the same manner as has been the case during World War II. These armed forces are not to be in a group separated from the control of their respective nations. They merely are assigned to the United Nations campaigns as they would be to any of their own nation's campaigns. This retention of connections between these troops and their own nations is due in part to the fact that a modern army cannot exist apart from the sources of supply of its modern equipment. There is no such thing as a self-sufficient armed force. An armed force of today requires not only men in uniform supplied with arms and ammunition, it needs, also, airplanes and back of them airplane factories and back of them aluminum production plants and back of them great sources of electric power, and coupled with these there must be available great sources of supply of food, clothing, and the many incidental items that go into the manufacture of modern fighting equipment. The armed forces of the United Nations will be, therefore, an Allied force comparable to that used in World War II, but greatly reduced in size and cost. This reduction will reflect the reduced need for Allied armed forces in the light of the Allied victory over all enemy forces of the world and in the light of the continuing cooperation of the Allied Nations through the formation of the United Nations, dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The effect of the Security Council as an enforcement agency is therefore to provide added unity and stability in a manner that may aid materially in maintaining international peace and security.

F. THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

In addition to the agencies outlined in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, the San Francisco Conference has indicated that provision will be made for a Trusteeship Council and administrative transitional arrangements to get the new organization started. The chapter dealing with the Trusteeship Council has not been available in final form, but it apparently will provide a new mechanism for the administration of certain areas inhabited by dependent people in the interest of the people who inhabit them and in the interest of future world security. The trustee system is to replace the system

of mandates established under the League of Nations. The territories may, therefore, include some territories now held under mandate, some which may be detached from enemy states as a result of World War II, and some voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration. The trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become members of the United Nations.

The basic objective of the trusteeship system in accordance with the purposes of the organization laid down in chapter I of the Charter shall be—

(A) To further international peace and security;

(B) To promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the trust territories and their inhabitants and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the trusteeship arrangement;

(C) To insure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations, and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice.

Some of the areas have special strategic importance. While the form is not primarily important, the substance of our rights in these areas is important. For example, whether or not the United States shall have sovereignty over points which are primarily of strategic importance to its own security and to the maintenance of peace and security in the Pacific, it is important that the United States shall have full legal right to use those areas for strategic purposes essential to its security and to future world security.

The proposed amendments that set up the Trusteeship Council are of considerable length and deserve careful consideration. They have not yet been finally adopted, but they cover many points which have been under public discussion. They are set forth in an unnumbered chapter at the end of exhibit A, which is to follow this discussion in the RECORD.

G. AMENDMENTS

The foregoing discussion has dealt with the United Nations Charter and has emphasized the value and, in fact, the urgency of its approval because of the means of making peaceful adjustments that it provides, and because of the provisions it makes for an International Court of Justice, an Economic and Social Council, the recognition of regional arrangements and agencies, a Security Council, and a Trusteeship Council, none of which would exist without this Charter.

There remains at least one further important consideration to be discussed in connection with the terms of this Charter. This is its provision for its own amendment.

One of the major reasons for the establishment of an international organization as distinguished from the writing of static treaties between nations is so that

the nations may have a flexible mechanism with which to meet changing conditions that threaten international peace and security. The establishment of the United Nations thus provides a going concern of substantial value to meet the then foreseeable conditions. This organization itself, however, will become a tragic hindrance to the peace of the world unless it can be changed itself to meet the changing needs of the time and to reflect the results of experience gained.

It is, therefore, a matter of major importance that the Charter shall contain appropriate provisions for its own amendment.

On the one hand, reasonable security against ill-considered amendments is an important factor in securing the consent of members to the Charter in the first instance. Equally important, however, is a reasonable degree of freedom of amendment.

The Charter necessarily contains some provisions that are unsatisfactory to some of its members but are not sufficiently objectionable to justify opposition to the Charter if the Charter contains a reasonable opportunity for its amendment in the light of future experience under it. This reasonable freedom of amendment is as important in securing approval of the Charter as is the protection of the Charter against unreasonable ease of amendment.

It has been suggested also that there be an opportunity to reconsider the provisions of the Charter at a specified future date by a general conference to be called by a substantial number of the members of the United Nations.

A precedent of interest on this subject is to be found in the provisions for the amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Provision is there made for two alternative procedures. In article V it is provided that—

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress: *Provided*, That no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

In the light of this article, which has proven to be reasonably satisfactory, it may be suggested that alternative modes of amendment be provided by the Charter of the United Nations. One procedure might be by way of a general conference and the other by way of specific amendments proposed to the Charter for separate adoption. The precedent set by the Constitution of the United States also confirms the suggestion that it is better to leave the time for the calling of such a conference or for considering individual amendments to the needs of the future rather than to attempt to specify now an arbitrary future date

when some action must be taken regardless of the desirability of it at that time.

Furthermore, the provision in the Constitution of the United States which excludes from the usual procedure of amendment any amendment which might deprive a State of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its own consent suggests that inasmuch as a veto power is to be incorporated in the original Charter of the United Nations, it might be appropriate to provide that no permanent member of the Security Council shall be deprived of its veto power by way of amendment without its own consent, but that all other amendments shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by the three-fourths of the members of the United States, including in such three-fourths at least three-fourths of the members of the United Nations then holding membership in the Security Council.

III. THE NECESSITY FOR OTHER ACTION IN ADDITION TO THE APPROVAL OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS IF SUCH APPROVAL BE GIVEN

Even if the Charter of the United Nations is ratified and the organization becomes a going concern, this is but one of many vital steps which need to be taken in the interest of a just and lasting peace. The Charter in itself will determine none of the actual terms of the peace. It will settle no questions of boundaries or of ethnic relations.

There will remain for consideration great numbers of international issues which will be constantly recurring until such time as a just and satisfactory solution of each has been reached on its merits. Some of these are already of long standing and are extremely difficult of solution. Each is of primary importance to the people directly concerned, and each has some significance in the continued peace and security of the world.

In connection with some of them, the United Nations organization may be of assistance. Many others, however, will fall far outside the scope of the United Nations agencies unless and until some dispute threatening the peace and security of the world might bring them before the United Nations. Among such, it is but necessary to mention such outstanding examples as the cases of Poland and Palestine both to illustrate the difficulties involved and to indicate the complete separation of those difficulties from the impending issue of the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations.

These difficult questions of boundaries and sovereignty certainly constitute no argument against the ratification of the Charter by the United States. In fact the existence of a United Nations organization dedicated to the observance of international law and to securing justice in international affairs should be a helpful influence rather than a hindrance in securing a hearing leading toward just and satisfactory solutions of these difficulties.

Apart from questions as to individual nations and conflicts of interest there are many issues of an international nature and some of a domestic character to

which it will be necessary for the Senate to give early consideration if America is to have lasting peace and prosperity. These issues are inescapable. Congress is already considering or is about to consider proposals to meet most of them.

It is necessary that we think of these as well as of the Charter of the United Nations if we are to see that Charter in its proper perspective. The Charter is a vitally important and primary step on the road to lasting peace; yet, after all, it is but one of many difficult and important steps which also are essential if peace and security are to be maintained in America, to say nothing of the world.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICIES

While not attempting to list, by any means, all of the international and domestic problems bearing upon the stability of America tomorrow, the following are among those deserving early attention.

First. Relief and rehabilitation of Allied occupied nations: This issue is to be distinguished from that relating to the treatment of conquered enemy nations. The latter is a separate problem, still primarily of a military nature, although soon calling for recognition by Congress through appropriations. The procedure in connection with the relief and rehabilitation of Allied occupied nations is also to be distinguished from the procedure which was adopted to meet their wartime needs under the lend-lease program. The problem of relief and rehabilitation of Allied occupied nations which themselves are unable to pay for that relief and rehabilitation is the problem now facing the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. There is a pressing emergency for carrying forward the program that is already under way. There also exists a need to visualize the end of the UNRRA relief program in accordance with its original intent. The end of UNRRA will leave the United States and the other Allied nations face to face with problems of postwar economic recovery in the light of their own future industrial possibilities, as well as in the light of the sufferings and destruction brought upon them by enemy occupation.

Second. The stability of international credit and foreign exchange: This is a necessary element in postwar stability and recovery. It is involved in the proposals before Congress for an International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, together with an International Monetary Fund. These proposals have grown out of the international conference held at Bretton Woods, N. H., in July 1944. The soundness of the International Bank and its proposal for the establishment of international credit have been generally approved. Recent modifications of policy have also been winning wider approval to the International Monetary Fund program than was at first evident. The monetary-fund program has been widely misunderstood. It is intended to supplement the establishment of international credit through securing standards of international trade which will avoid consequences similar to those experienced between World War I and World

War II as a result of the devaluation of national currencies and a general resort to various types of cut-throat competition among nations. These practices contributed to the world-wide depression. While this plan requires clarification, it is equally important to recognize that the early stabilization of international trade is a primary condition of world-wide and domestic recovery. So unless some better substitute is produced to help stabilize international exchange and to improve its standards of doing business, it will be important to proceed with this plan.

Third. Food: While our first responsibility is to provide opportunity to secure adequate food supplies within the United States for both our military and civilian population, there also exists a need for increasing the nutritive value and the efficiency and volume of the production and distribution of foods among our Allied nations, so that they may fully sustain themselves as soon as possible. The Food and Agriculture Organization developed at Hot Springs, Va., in May 1943, was an attempt to reach this need.

Fourth. The restoration of educational systems among our allies, to say nothing of the problem in the Axis Nations, is a problem upon which the peace and stability of the world necessarily depend. The importance of these educational systems increases in proportion to the extent to which reliance is placed upon the principle of self-government in these nations. Emergency problems exist among our allies whose educational and cultural institutions were destroyed by the Axis Powers. This situation not only calls for the securing of ordinary school equipment, but it also opens the door to America and to Great Britain for guidance in teaching scientific and industrial processes and in providing laboratory equipment among our allies, in place of the processes and equipment formerly supplied from Axis sources. The important opportunities involved in this need were considered at the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, held in London in April 1944, at which the United States was represented by a commission under the chairmanship of WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, now a Member of the United States Senate. The need for the continuance of this interest is self-evident.

Fifth. International civil aviation presents one of the most important fields of international development. Today, due to the war, America leads the world in aviation. There will naturally develop substantial competition for international civil aviation in the postwar period. The peace and prosperity of the world and of America are closely related to and can be greatly benefited by developments in this field. Consideration was given to them at the Civil Aviation Conference held at Chicago in 1944. An important issue which is to be decided as a matter of domestic policy of the United States is how to regulate the participation of American interests in international aviation. It must be decided upon the basis of what policy will best develop the aviation industry of America, in connection with a world-wide advance in this new field of human enterprise.

Sixth. International communications and their regulation are more vital than ever to the access of America to the rest of the world and to the continuance of our international trade. In past years the Universal Postal Union and the Communication and Transit Organization have existed in connection with the League of Nations. New issues are now presented in the fields of cable and radio communication, and they offer new opportunities for America. The policy of the United States on these issues is yet to be developed, and we undoubtedly shall be called upon soon to join with the other nations of the world in the consideration of these issues.

Seventh. International Labor Organization: This important activity has survived the general abandonment of other activities of the League of Nations. The United States has been a member of the ILO since 1924, and it is now being carried on with offices primarily in Canada. The importance of international labor issues was recognized at the International Labor Conference held in Philadelphia in 1944. While this field may yield critical and important developments domestically as well as internationally, the international issues are important to the future peace and prosperity of the world. They should command the continued interest and support of the United States.

Eighth. General international trade and travel: The development of international postwar trade is important not only to the United States but to all other nations. The degree to which we and other nations shall find it necessary to protect home industries presents issues of an economic and commercial nature which usually can better be solved in detail by administrative bodies fully informed on the facts, rather than by legislative bodies, except on issues of general policy. In this field comes the question of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, now the pending business before the Senate. While there are important reasons for the extension of the life of this act, the proposed measure raises a serious question, for example, as to the extent to which the executive branch of the Government should be permitted to adjust legislative tariffs up or down without coming back to Congress for approval of the variations.

Apart from international trade in the ordinary sense, there will develop a new opportunity for international travel, which carries with it tremendous possibilities for the benefit of both the United States and foreign nations. Tourist travel will transport American funds abroad in a manner which will not seriously compete with American productive industries. Distribution of such funds abroad will improve international personal relations, and at the same time will help to develop purchasing power for American-made goods.

Ninth. The United States merchant marine presents an important domestic and international problem. Following the war, we shall have by far the largest merchant marine fleet in the world and in our history. If we are to maintain an

Army, Navy, and Air Corps of substantial proportions in connection with our obligations to the United Nations, or in connection with our own policy, we shall need to maintain a large merchant marine as an emergency auxiliary to those forces. It would present an added reason for a Federal interest in our merchant marine service. Having built the ships and trained the men which will enable us to carry the traffic of the world, America may well seek to retain that trade and not again be driven from it by competition based upon standards of wages and living so much lower than that available to American seamen as to be regarded as against public interest.

Tenth. International freedom of expression and of the press: This subject is related to that of cable and radio communication, but it is broader than that issue. It has become clear that an important factor in the maintenance of international peace and understanding is access to and publication of the truth in making known the news of the world. America's interest in this extends not only to the news to be published in America but in the news to be published about America and the United Nations in general throughout the world. While this presents a major and difficult issue of international policy, it has not as yet received the public recognition or support that it deserves.

Eleventh. Treaty-making process of the United States: If the United States ratifies the Charter of the United Nations, and by entering that organization assumes a new and greater share in the international problems of tomorrow, there will be an increased need for the current consideration of foreign policies and international treaties in the light of these closer relationships. Our Constitution now provides for the passage of laws affecting the internal affairs of this Nation, and for the appropriation of funds affecting both the internal and external affairs of this Nation by a majority vote of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, followed by the approval of the President. This procedure has made possible constructive and rapid action based upon the will of the majority of Americans as currently reflected through the two Houses of Congress and the President. On the other hand, our Constitution in the case of treaties does not provide the same facility for their approval. It is based upon an early policy which sought to preserve to one-third of the States a veto power over treaties. There were especially in mind at that time treaties affecting the New England fisheries or traffic in the Gulf of Mexico, which the States in those respective areas were particularly interested in controlling. While these conditions have greatly changed, the requirement still exists that treaties must have the consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. This places a veto power over treaties in one-third plus one of the Members of the Senate. Theoretically, at least, this places a veto power in the hands of the Members of the Senate who might well be representing at the time not merely one-third of the population, but as little as 8 percent of

the population of the Nation. This results in a negative control of our foreign policy by a minority rather than by a majority of the Senate, and therefore by the representatives of a minority rather than by a majority of the people of the United States.

If and when the United States shall ratify the Charter of the United Nations and become a member of the United Nations, there will then arise a new and closer relationship between the United States and the rest of the world which will place a greater need upon the United States for prompt and representative constructive action in our foreign affairs than in the past. This change of relationship suggests the propriety of the Senate's at least submitting to the people at that time a proposal for a constitutional amendment on this subject. The same two-thirds of the Senate that shall have voted to ratify the United Nations treaty would be thoroughly justified in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment which, in the light of changed conditions, would permit a change in the constitutional procedure so that thereafter a treaty could be made binding upon the United States after its negotiation by the President and its approval by a majority vote in each House of Congress, in much the same manner as a domestic statute is now enacted.

The submission of such an amendment by a vote of two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House, subject to approval by the vote of three-fourths of the States, would be a step thoroughly in keeping with a desire to afford to the people of the United States an opportunity to take part in the foreign policy of this Nation with the same facility as they now take part in the conduct of its domestic affairs.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I have listened with great interest to the Senator's list of the various and specific measures which this Nation must adopt in addition to joining the United Nations organization. I am wondering if the fact should not also be stressed that the establishment of the United Nations organization, as well as the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, will merely provide the machinery through which the peace-loving nations of the world may act jointly in order to prevent another war, and that that machinery will not succeed unless it is supported continually through the years by the governments and the peoples of the member nations.

I am thinking particularly of the League of Nations. The League of Nations could not act except by unanimity of its membership, and that fact resulted in a much greater deterrent to action than the so-called veto powers. The League declared Japan to be an aggressor in 1931, and Italy in 1936. The member nations of the League did not specify their objections under the covenant by going to the assistance of China and Ethiopia. It was the lack of support, rather than the weakness of the peoples,

of the various nations which, in my opinion, caused the League to fail.

I wonder if the Senator from Ohio does not want to stress that the establishment of this world organization would merely give us an opportunity to act, and that unless we pass the essential enabling legislation which will make available to the Security Council the necessary force, the organization will not be in position to succeed or to operate successfully.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his emphasis on the point which he has so clearly made. I agree with him entirely in his statement. When the Charter comes to the Senate from San Francisco it will be followed by a supplementary agreement relating to the armed forces. Then there must also be a willingness to put it into execution and make it function. To my mind the Charter from San Francisco will be the first of a series of steps which must be taken if we are to have international stability upon which our peace security depends.

AMERICA'S DOMESTIC ISSUES

It has been demonstrated that international stability is a domestic necessity for our own recovery. So also, our domestic stability and prosperity as determined by our domestic policies are not only matters of national concern but of international importance under the present interdependent relations of the nations of the world. In this domestic field our obligations are more familiar to our public and to Congress, but that makes them nonetheless important for mention here. These policies deal with issues which are still closer to our individual American citizens than the international policies which have been discussed. Among the domestic policies thus crying for early consideration and vital to the stability of America tomorrow are the following:

First. National solvency: This presents the vital need for stopping the increase of our national debt following the end of the war, carrying the load of our present debt, changing and adjusting our taxes so that they will be stabilized and will encourage, rather than discourage, production. This calls for an end to deficit financing of our Federal operating expenditures.

Second. Increased production and full employment: This calls for understanding and cooperation between management, labor, agriculture, and Government. It calls for a recognition of the need for policies and relations which will produce ever-increasing production as the key to ever-increasing prosperity and to substantially full employment.

Third. Inventions and new products: Many of these offer the promise of infinitely greater returns from human effort in the future than in the past. In them is an important part of the key to increased production based upon the same expenditure of manpower. Many of these new materials, methods, and products were mentioned earlier in this statement in pointing out the great possibilities connected with them provided there shall be international stability and reasonable assurance of international

stability for a substantial number of years to come and which would permit the return to peacetime production of men, material, and invested capital.

Fourth. Improved housing: There still exist large disgraceful slums and blighted areas in our heavily populated centers. Improved housing materials and methods of construction offer new opportunities for the building of private as well as public housing to meet this need.

Fifth. Improved health conditions, safety programs, and physical standards: These all make direct contributions to productiveness and prosperity. Attention has been called to them by the many physical defects discovered in connection with the draft of men for military service. There is need for greater hospital facilities in many rural and other areas. These should be developed through privately owned as well as publicly owned agencies, but need not call for public operation of these agencies if carefully located in accordance with the needs of the population.

Sixth. Educational progress as the foundation of democracy: The need for improved education in many parts of the Nation has been emphasized by the lack of education disclosed in the draft of men for military service. The Nation as a whole suffers from such educational defects in its citizenry, and it is important that means be found to overcome such lack of facilities while at the same time protecting our educational policies as against encroachment by the Federal Government.

Seventh. Military training: This will present an issue which will be largely affected by the quota of military forces which may become the obligation of the United States in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. In the absence of the determination of that quota and its implications, this issue need not and should not be determined inasmuch as the immediate needs are amply met by the Selective Service Act until May 15, 1946.

Eighth. Fair employment practices: These present an issue which should be met with thorough consistency with our national purposes and ideals. It is important to consider which practices should be under local as contrasted with Federal control. Following the precedent set during this war, Federal regulation of practices naturally should extend to and also be limited to employment that is in whole or in part supported by Federal taxes. These taxes are collected without racial or other personal discrimination and therefore should be expended likewise. The success of these policies will depend primarily upon the general public support of the policy involved.

Ninth. There is need for development of a code of fair industrial and labor relations as the foundation of industrial production upon which our standards of living depend. This is of primary importance to labor, to management, and to the public. If there is to be industrial peace and prosperity, it is vitally important that the utmost fairness be available to all parties concerned in such pro-

duction whether they be employer or employee and whether they be members or officials of organized labor or of employer organizations and whether they be members or not members of any organization whatever.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Mr. President, there are many more domestic issues of importance. The foregoing have been mentioned so that it may be clear that in passing upon our international problems we must not overlook the vitally important domestic problems of our time. Neither our international nor our domestic policies alone can fully meet the needs of America tomorrow. Our needs are in both fields and require constant attention.

In the field of international and domestic relations, America bears an extraordinary responsibility of leadership at this time. Not only is America the leading creditor nation, military nation, and industrial nation of the world, but it is also the nation whose history most naturally fits it for a demonstration of the soundness of the recognition of the individual rights of men and of nations to full freedom of opportunity based upon justice and fairness rather than upon size, strength, wealth, race, color, or creed. With the exception of those of American Indian descent, most of our population or their forefathers came to America to seek greater freedom of individual opportunity. America is not so much a place as it is a people bound together by a common ideal. This ideal is the ideal of human liberty and opportunity; our obligation and purpose in connection with it was most perfectly expressed in the concluding sentence of Lincoln's second inaugural address delivered from this Capitol Building 80 years ago. He then said, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

EXHIBIT A

THE UNITED NATIONS DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS FOR A GENERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION IN THE ORIGINAL FORM IN WHICH THEY WERE TO BE THE SUBJECT OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE AT SAN FRANCISCO, APRIL 25, 1945

There should be established an international Organization under the title of the United Nations, the charter of which should contain provisions necessary to give effect to the proposals which follow:

CHAPTER I. PURPOSES

The purposes of the Organization should be:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems; and

4. To afford a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

CHAPTER II. PRINCIPLES

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in chapter I, the Organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

2. All members of the Organization undertake, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the Organization, to fulfill the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter.

3. All members of the Organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

4. All members of the Organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization.

5. All members of the Organization shall give every assistance to the Organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

6. All members of the Organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the Organization.

The Organization should insure that states not members of the Organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER III. MEMBERSHIP

1. Membership of the Organization should be open to all peace-loving states.

CHAPTER IV. PRINCIPAL ORGANS

1. The Organization should have as its principal organs:

- a. A General Assembly;
- b. A Security Council;
- c. An International Court of Justice; and
- d. A Secretariat.

2. The Organization should have such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary.

CHAPTER V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SECTION A. Composition: All members of the Organization should be members of the General Assembly and should have a number of representatives to be specified in the charter.

SEC. B. Functions and powers: 1. The General Assembly should have the right to consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the Organization or by the Security Council; and to make recommendations with regard to any such principles or questions. Any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion. The General Assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the Security Council.

2. The General Assembly should be empowered to admit new members to the Organization upon recommendation of the Security Council.

3. The General Assembly should, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be

empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the Security Council. The General Assembly should be empowered, upon recommendation of the Security Council, to expel from the Organization any member of the Organization which persistently violates the principles contained in the charter.

4. The General Assembly should elect the nonpermanent members of the Security Council and the members of the Economic and Social Council provided for in chapter IX. It should be empowered to elect upon recommendation of the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the Organization. It should perform such functions in relation to the election of the judges of the International Court of Justice as may be conferred upon it by the statute of the court.

5. The General Assembly should apportion the expenses among the members of the Organization and should be empowered to approve the budgets of the Organization.

6. The General Assembly should initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in political, economic and social fields and of adjusting situations likely to impair the general welfare.

7. The General Assembly should make recommendations for the coordination of the policies of international economic, social, and other specialized agencies brought into relation with the Organization in accordance with agreements between such agencies and the Organization.

8. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council and reports from other bodies of the Organization.

SEC. C. VOTING. 1. Each member of the Organization should have one vote in the General Assembly.

2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; election of members of the Security Council; election of members of the Economic and Social Council; admission of members, suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of members, and expulsion of members; and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, the decisions of the General Assembly should be made by a simple majority vote.

SEC. D. PROCEDURE. 1. The General Assembly should meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require.

2. The General Assembly should adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its president for each session.

3. The General Assembly should be empowered to set up such bodies and agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions.

CHAPTER VI. THE SECURITY COUNCIL

SECTION A. COMPOSITION. The Security Council should consist of one representative of each of 11 members of the Organization. Representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and, in due course, France, should have permanent seats. The General Assembly should elect six states to fill the nonpermanent seats. These six states should be elected for a term of 2 years, three retiring each year. They should not be immediately eligible for reelection. In the first election of the nonpermanent members three should

be chosen by the General Assembly for 1-year terms and three for 2-year terms.

SEC. B. PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS AND POWERS.

1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the Organization, members of the Organization should by the charter confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and should agree that in carrying out these duties under this responsibility it should act on their behalf.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council should act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

3. The specific powers conferred on the Security Council in order to carry out these duties are laid down in chapter VIII.

4. All members of the Organization should obligate themselves to accept the decisions of the Security Council and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

5. In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least resources for armaments, the Security Council, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 9, should have the responsibility for formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments or submission to the members of the Organization.

(Here follows the text of section C as proposed at the Crimea Conference:)

SEC. C. VOTING. 1. Each member of the Security Council should have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter VIII, section A, and under the second sentence of paragraph 1 of chapter VIII, section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

SEC. D. PROCEDURE. 1. The Security Council should be so organized as to be able to function continuously and each state member of the Security Council should be permanently represented at the headquarters of the organization. It may hold meetings at such other places as in its judgment may best facilitate its work. There should be periodic meetings at which each state member of the Security Council could if it so desired be represented by a member of the Government or some other special representative.

2. The Security Council should be empowered to set up such bodies or agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions including regional subcommittees of the Military Staff Committee.

3. The Security Council should adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its president.

4. Any member of the Organization should participate in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the Security Council considers that the interests of that member of the Organization are specially affected.

5. Any member of the Organization not having a seat on the Security Council and any state not a member of the Organization, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, should be invited to participate in the discussion relating to the dispute.

CHAPTER VII. AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. There should be an international court of justice which should constitute the principal judicial organ of the Organization.

2. The court should be constituted and should function in accordance with a statute which should be annexed to and be a part of the charter of the Organization.

3. The statute of the Court of International Justice should be either (a) the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, continued in force with such modifications as may be desirable or (b) a new statute in the preparation of which the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice should be used as a basis.

4. All members of the Organization should ipso facto be parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice.

5. Conditions under which states not members of the Organization may become parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice should be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

CHAPTER VIII. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY INCLUDING PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF AGGRESSION

SECTION A. Pacific settlement of disputes:

1. The Security Council should be empowered to investigate any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

2. Any state, whether member of the Organization or not, may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the General Assembly or of the Security Council.

3. The parties to any dispute the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves, first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement, or other peaceful means of their own choice. The Security Council should call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

4. If, nevertheless, parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 3 above fail to settle it by the means indicated in that paragraph, they should obligate themselves to refer it to the Security Council. The Security Council should in each case decide whether or not the continuance of the particular dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and, accordingly, whether the Security Council should deal with the dispute, and, if so, whether it should take action under paragraph 5.

5. The Security Council should be empowered, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 3 above, to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

6. Justiciable disputes should normally be referred to the international court of justice. The Security Council should be empowered to refer to the court, for advice, legal questions connected with other disputes.

7. The provisions of paragraph 1 to 6 of section A should not apply to situations or disputes arising out of matters which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the state concerned.

SEC. B. Determination of threats to the peace or acts of aggression and action with respect thereto: 1. Should the Security Council deem that a failure to settle a dispute in accordance with procedures indicated in paragraph 3 of section A, or in accordance with its recommendations made under paragraph 5 of section A, constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security, it should take any measures necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

2. In general the Security Council should determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and should make recommendations or decide upon the measures to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

3. The Security Council should be empowered to determine what diplomatic, economic, or other measures not involving the use of armed force should be employed to give effect to its decisions, and to call upon members of the Organization to apply such measures. Such measures may include complete or partial interruption of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication and the severance of diplomatic and economic relations.

4. Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the Organization.

5. In order that all members of the Organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities, and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the numbers and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and should in each case be subject to approval by the Security Council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

6. In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the organization there should be held immediately available by the members of the organization national airforce contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in paragraph 5 above.

7. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security should be taken by all the members of the Organization in cooperation or by some of them as the Security Council may determine. This undertaking should be carried out by the members of the organization by their own action and through action of the appropriate specialized organizations and agencies of which they are members.

8. Plans for the application of armed force should be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in paragraph 9 below.

9. There should be established a Military Staff Committee the functions of which should be to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, to the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, to the regulation of armaments, and to possible disarmament. It should be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. The committee should be composed of the chiefs of staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any member of the Organization not permanently represented on the committee should be invited by the committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the committee's responsibilities requires that such a state should participate in its work.

Questions of command of forces should be worked out subsequently.

10. The members of the Organization should join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

11. Any state, whether a member of the organization or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of measures which have been decided upon by the Security Council should have the right to consult the Security Council in regard to a solution of those problems.

SEC. C. Regional arrangements. 1. Nothing in the charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the organization. The Security Council should encourage settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

3. The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER IX. ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COOPERATION

SECTION A. Purpose and relationships. 1. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the Organization should facilitate solutions of international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Responsibility for the discharge of this function should be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in an Economic and Social Council.

2. The various specialized economic, social, and other organizations and agencies would have responsibilities in their respective fields as defined in their statutes. Each such organization or agency should be brought into relationship with the organization on terms to be determined by agreement between the Economic and Social Council and the appropriate authorities of the specialized organization or agency, subject to approval by the General Assembly.

SEC. B. Composition and voting. The Economic and Social Council should consist of representatives of 18 members of the organization. The states to be represented for this purpose should be elected by the General Assembly for terms of 3 years. Each such state should have one representative, who should have one vote. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council should be taken by simple majority vote of those present and voting.

SEC. C. Functions and powers of the Economic and Social Council. 1. The Economic and Social Council should be empowered:

(a) To carry out, within the scope of its functions, recommendations of the General Assembly;

(b) To make recommendations, on its own initiative, with respect to international eco-

nomic, social, and other humanitarian matters;

(c) To receive and consider reports from the economic, social, and other organizations or agencies brought into relationship with the Organization, and to coordinate their activities through consultations with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies;

(d) To examine the administrative budgets of such specialized organizations or agencies with a view to making recommendations to the organizations or agencies concerned;

(e) To enable the Secretary-General to provide information to the Security Council;

(f) To assist the Security Council upon its request; and

(g) To perform such other functions within the general scope of its competence as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

SEC. D. Organization and procedure. 1. The Economic and Social Council should set up an economic commission, a social commission, and such other commissions as may be required. These commissions should consist of experts. There should be a permanent staff which should constitute a part of the secretariat of the Organization.

2. The Economic and Social Council should make suitable arrangements for representatives of the specialized organizations or agencies to participate without vote in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it.

3. The Economic and Social Council should adopt its own rules of procedure and the method of selecting its president.

CHAPTER X. THE SECRETARIAT

1. There should be a secretariat comprising a secretary-general and such staff as may be required. The secretary-general should be the chief administrative officer of the Organization. He should be elected by the General Assembly, on recommendation of the Security Council, for such term and under such conditions as are specified in the charter.

2. The secretary-general should act in that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, and of the Economic and Social Council and should make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

3. The secretary-general should have the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security.

CHAPTER XI. AMENDMENTS

Amendments should come into force for all members of the Organization, when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by the members of the Organization having permanent membership on the Security Council and by a majority of the other members of the Organization.

CHAPTER XII. TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Pending the coming into force of the special agreement or agreements referred to in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 5, and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of the Four-Nation Declaration, signed at Moscow, October 30, 1943, the states parties to that Declaration should consult with one another and as occasion arises with other members of the Organization with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. No provision of the charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as a result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

NOTE

In addition to the question of voting procedure in the Security Council referred to in chapter VI, several other questions are still under consideration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 7, 1944 [released October 9, 1944].

[From the New York Times of June 10, 1945]
TEXT OF THE ALMOST COMPLETED CHARTER OF
THE NEW WORLD SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS

THE PREAMBLE

We, the peoples of the United Nations,

Determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and value of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and, for these ends,

To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

To accept principles and to institute methods to insure that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

To employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement of all peoples, through our representatives assembled at San Francisco, agree to this charter.

CHAPTER I. PURPOSES

The purposes of the Organization are:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which may lead to a breach of the peace.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

3. To achieve international cooperation in the solution of international problems of economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian character and promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion or sex; and

4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

CHAPTER II. PRINCIPLES

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in chapter I the Organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

2. All members of the Organization shall fulfill the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the Organization.

3. All members of the Organization shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that interna-

tional peace, security, and justice are not endangered.

4. All members of the Organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any member or state or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization.

5. All members of the Organization shall give every assistance to the Organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

6. All members of the Organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the Organization.

7. The Organization shall insure that states not members of the Organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

8. Nothing contained in this charter shall authorize the Organization to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under this charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of chapter VIII, section B.

CHAPTER III. MEMBERSHIP

1. The initial members are the signatories of the charter whose ratification has become effective in accordance with chapter XI.

2. Membership of the Organization is open to all peace-loving states which, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and ready to accept and carry out the obligations contained in the charter.

CHAPTER IV. PRINCIPAL ORGANS

1. The Organization has as its principal organs:

- A. A General Assembly;
- B. A Security Council;
- C. An Economic and Social Council;
- D. An International Court of Justice; and
- E. A Secretariat.

2. The Organization should have such subsidiary agencies as may be found necessary.

3. The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs.

CHAPTER V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Section A. Composition

The General Assembly shall consist of representatives of members of the organization. Each member may have not more than five representatives.

Section B. Functions and powers

1. The General Assembly shall have the right to discuss any matter within the sphere of international relations; and, subject to the exception embodied in paragraph 2 below, to make recommendations to the members of the organization or to the Security Council, or both, on any such matters.

2. In particular and without limiting the generality of the preceding paragraph, the General Assembly shall have the right—

A. To consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and to make recommendations to the governments or to the Security Council on such principles;

B. To discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the Organization or by the Security Council, and to make recommendations to the governments or to the Security Council, or both, with regard to any such question. Any such questions on which ac-

tion is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion. The General Assembly shall have the right to call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security. While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it under this charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests. The secretary general shall be required, with the consent of the Security Council, to notify the General Assembly at each session of any matter relative to the maintenance of international peace or security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and also to notify the General Assembly immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

3. The General Assembly may admit new members to the Organization upon recommendation of the Security Council.

4. The Organization may at any time suspend from the exercise of the rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council, or which shall have violated the principles of the charter in a grave and persistent fashion. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored in accordance with the procedure laid down in chapter —, paragraph —.

5. The General Assembly shall elect the nonpermanent members of the Security Council and the members of the Economic and Social Council. It shall elect the secretary general of the Organization upon the recommendation of the Security Council, made by an affirmative vote of seven members. The General Assembly shall participate in the election of the judges of the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the statute of the court.

6. The General Assembly shall apportion the expenses among the members of the Organization, it shall consider and approve the budgets of the Organization as well as any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies brought into relationship with the Organization under the provisions of chapter IX, section B.

7. The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in the political, economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, assisting in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex, and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.

8. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this section, the General Assembly should be empowered to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situations, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the purposes and principles set forth in this charter.

9. The General Assembly should make recommendations for the coordination of the policies of international economic, social, cultural, health, and other specialized agencies brought into relation with the Organization in accordance with agreements between such agencies and the Organization.

10. The General Assembly should examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned.

11. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from

the Security Council; such reports should include an account of the measures which the Security Council has adopted or applied to maintain international peace and security.

Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2 of this section, the General Assembly should be empowered:

(A) To approve or disapprove in whole or in part any report from the Security Council and to make any recommendations or observations thereon;

(B) To submit recommendations to the Security Council with a view to insuring complete observance of the duties of the Security Council inherent in its responsibilities to maintain international peace and security.

The General Assembly shall receive and consider reports from the other bodies of the Organization and make any recommendations or observations thereon.

Section C. Voting

1. Each member of the Organization shall have one vote in the General Assembly. A member which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote so long as its arrears amount to its contributions for two full years. The General Assembly may waive the penalty if it is satisfied that the reasons for delay in payment are beyond control of the state in question.

2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, election of members of the Security Council, election of members of the Economic and Social Council, admission of members, suspension of the rights and privileges of members and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. The General Assembly shall decide by a majority of those present and voting all other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority.

Section D. Procedure

1. The General Assembly shall meet in a regular annual session and in such special sessions as occasion may require. Special sessions shall be convened by the secretary general at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the members of the Organization.

2. The General Assembly shall adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its president for each session.

3. The General Assembly may set up such bodies and agencies as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

CHAPTER VI. THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Section A. Composition

The Security Council should consist of one representative of each of 11 members of the Organization. Representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and France, should have permanent seats. The General Assembly should elect six states to fill the nonpermanent seats, due regard being specially paid in the first instance to the contribution of members of the Organization toward the maintenance of international peace and security and toward the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution. These six states should be elected for a term of 2 years, three retiring each year. They should not be immediately eligible for reelection. In the first election of the nonpermanent members three should be chosen by the General Assembly for 1-year terms and three for 2-year terms.

Section B. Principal functions and powers

1. In order to insure prompt and effective action by the Organization, members of the Organization should by the charter confer on

the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and should agree that, in carrying out these duties under this responsibility, it should act on their behalf. The Security Council shall make annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council should act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

3. The specific powers conferred on the Security Council in order to carry out these duties are laid down in chapter VIII.

4. All members of the Organization should obligate themselves to accept the decisions of the Security Council and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

5. In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments, the Security Council, with the assistance of the military staff committee referred to in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 10, should have the responsibility for formulating plans for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments for submission to the members of the Organization.

6. The Security Council shall participate in the election of the judges of the International Court of Justice in accordance with the statute of the court.

Section C. Voting

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

3. Decision of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter VIII, section A, and under the third sentence of paragraph 1 of chapter VIII, section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

Section D. Procedure

1. The Security Council should be so organized as to be able to function continuously and each state member of the Security Council should be permanently represented at the headquarters of the Organization. It may hold meetings at such other places as in its judgment may best facilitate its work. There should be periodic meetings at which each state member of the Security Council could, if it so desired, be represented by a member of the Government or some other special representative.

2. The Security Council should be empowered to set up such bodies or agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions.

3. The Security Council should adopt its own rules of procedure, including methods of selecting its president.

4. Any member of the Organization should participate in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the Security Council considers that the interests of that member of the Organization are specially affected.

5. Any member of the Organization not having a seat on the Security Council, and any state not a member of the Organization, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, should be invited to participate in the discussion relating to the dispute. In the case of a nonmember, the Security Council should lay down such conditions as it may deem just for the participation of such a nonmember.

CHAPTER VII. AN INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. A tribunal to be called the International Court of Justice is hereby established as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations.

2. The court shall be constituted and shall function in accordance with the annexed statute which forms an integral part of the charter of the United Nations.

3. Nothing in this charter shall prevent the parties from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

4. The statute is based upon the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

5. All parties to the charter are ipso facto parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice.

6. Conditions under which states not parties to the charter may become parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice shall be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

7. All members of the United Nations undertake to comply with the decisions of the International Court of Justice.

8. In the event of a state's failure to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may make recommendations or decide upon measures to give effect to the judgment.

9. The General Assembly and the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.

CHAPTER VIII. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY INCLUDING PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF AGGRESSION

Section A. Pacific settlement of disputes

1. Without prejudice to the provisions of paragraphs 3-6 below, the Security Council should be empowered, if all the parties so request, to make recommendations to the parties to any dispute with a view to its settlement in accordance with the principles laid down in chapter II, paragraph 3.

2. The Security Council should be empowered to investigate any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

3. Any state, whether a member of the Organization or not, may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the General Assembly or of the Security Council. In the case of a nonmember, it should be required to accept for the purposes of such dispute the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the charter.

4. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves, first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice. The Security Council should call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

5. If, nevertheless, parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 4 above fail to settle it by means indicated in that paragraph, they should obligate themselves to refer it to the Security Council. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the particular dispute is, in fact, likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under paragraph 6 or 7, or whether itself to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

6. The Security Council should be empowered, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in paragraph 4 above, to recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

7. Justiciable disputes should normally be referred to the International Court of Justice. The Security Council should be empowered to refer to the court, for advice, legal questions connected with other disputes.

Section B. Determination of threats to the peace or acts of aggression and action with respect thereto

1. The Security Council should determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and should make recommendations or decide upon the measures set forth in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this section to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

2. Before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures for the maintenance or restoration of peace and security in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 the Security Council may call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it may deem necessary or desirable in order to prevent an aggravation of the situation. Such provisional measures should be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. Failure to comply with such provisional measures should be duly taken account of by the Security Council.

3. The Security Council should be empowered to determine what diplomatic, economic, or other measures not involving the use of armed force should be employed to give effect to its decisions, and to call upon members of the Organization to apply such measures. Such measures may include complete or partial interruption of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication and the severance of diplomatic and economic relations.

4. Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval, or land forces of members of the Organization.

5. In order that all members of the Organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance and facilities including rights of passage necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness, and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council and concluded between the Security Council and member states, or between the Security Council and groups of member states. All such agreements should be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

6. When a decision to use force has been taken by the Security Council, it shall, before calling upon any member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of its obligations under the preceding paragraphs, invite such member, if it so requests, to send a representative to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of its armed forces.

7. In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the Organization there should be held immediately available by the members of the Organization national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in paragraph 5 above.

8. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security should be taken by all the members of the Organization in cooperation or by some of them as the Security Council may determine. This undertaking should be carried out by the members of the Organization by their own action and through action of the appropriate specialized organizations and agencies of which they are members.

9. Plans for the application of armed force should be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in paragraph 10 below.

10. There should be established a Military Staff Committee, the functions of which should be to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, to the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, to the regulation of armaments and to possible disarmament. It should be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. The committee should be composed of the chiefs of staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any member of the Organization not permanently represented on the committee should be invited by the committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the committee's responsibilities requires that such a state should participate in its work. Questions of command of forces should be worked out subsequently. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council, after consultation with regional agencies, may establish military subcommittees of the Military Staff Committee.

11. The members of the Organization should join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

12. Any state, whether a member of the Organization or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of measures which have been decided upon by the Security Council should have the right to consult the Security Council in regard to a solution of those problems.

Section C. Regional arrangements

1. Nothing in the charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agents for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization. The member states comprising such agencies or entering into such arrangements should make every effort to achieve peaceful settlement of local disputes through such agencies or arrangements before referring them to the Security Council. The Security Council should encourage the development of peaceful settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies, either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

This paragraph in no way impairs the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of section A of this chapter.

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council with the exception of measures against enemy states in this war provided for pursuant to chapter XII, paragraph 2, or, in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of such states, until such time as

the organization may, on request of the governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by a state now at war with the United Nations.

3. The Security Council should at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Section D

Nothing in this charter impairs the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member state, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under this charter to take at any time such action as it may deem necessary in order to maintain, or restore, international peace and security.

CHAPTER IX. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL: ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Section A. Purposes

1. With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the organization shall promote:

A. Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

B. Solutions of international economic, social, health, and other related problems; international, cultural, and educational cooperation; and

C. Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex.

Responsibility for the discharge of this function shall be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council.

2. All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of these purposes.

Section B. Relationships

1. The various specialized intergovernmental organizations and agencies having wide international responsibilities in economic, social, and other related fields, as defined in their basic instrument, shall be brought into relationship with the organization on terms to be determined by agreement between the Economic and Social Council and the appropriate authorities of the specialized organizations of agencies subject to approval by the General Assembly.

2. The organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the nations concerned for the creation of any specialized organization or agency required for the accomplishment of the purpose set out above.

Section C. Council: Composition and voting

The Economic and Social Council shall consist of representatives of 18 members of the Organization. The states to be represented for this purpose shall be elected by the General Assembly. The term of service of the members shall be 3 years, but arrangements shall be made after the first election for six of the members chosen at that election to retire after 1 year, and six after 2 years. Members shall be eligible for reelection at any time. Each member shall have one representative who shall have one vote. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council shall be taken by a simple majority of those present and voting.

Section D. Functions and powers of the Council

In addition to the functions enumerated elsewhere, the Economic and Social Council shall be empowered:

(A) To carry out, within the scope of its functions, recommendations of the General Assembly;

(B) To make recommendations, on its own initiative, for promoting respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

(C) To make and to initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, health, and other related matters, and to make recommendations, on its own initiative, on such matters to the General Assembly, to members of the Organization, and to specialized organizations or agencies concerned;

(D) To coordinate the activities of the economic, social, cultural, health, and other specialized organizations or agencies brought into relation with the Organization, through consultation with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the members of the Organization;

(E) To obtain regular reports from the specialized organizations or agencies, to obtain reports from the members of the Organization, and from the specialized organizations or agencies on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations and to those of the General Assembly; and to communicate its observations on such reports to the General Assembly;

(F) To perform services at the request of members of the Organization and at the request of specialized organizations or agencies with respect to economic, social, cultural, health, and other related matters, subject to the approval of the General Assembly;

(G) To call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Organization, international conferences on matters falling within the scope of the functions of the Council;

(H) To prepare draft conventions, with respect to matters falling within its competence, for submission to the General Assembly;

(I) To furnish information to the Security Council;

(J) To assist the Security Council upon its request; and

(K) To perform such other functions within the general scope of its competence as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

Section E. Organization

1. The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in the fields of economic and social activities and for the promotion of human rights, and such other commissions as may be required in the fields within the competence of the Council.

2. The Economic and Social Council shall invite any member of the Organization to participate, without vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that member.

3. The Economic and Social Council may make arrangements for representatives of the specialized organizations or agencies brought into relationship with the Organization to participate, without vote, in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it, and for its representatives to participate in the deliberations of such specialized organizations or agencies.

4. The Economic and Social Council shall be authorized to make suitable arrangements for consultation with nongovernmental organizations which are concerned with matters within the competence of the Council. Such arrangements may apply both to international organizations and, where appropriate, to national organizations after consultation with the member state concerned.

5. There shall be a permanent staff which shall constitute a part of the secretariat of the organization.

6. The Economic and Social Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure and the method of selecting its president. The Economic and Social Council shall meet as required in accordance with rules adopted by the Council. These rules shall include provision for the calling of a meeting on the request of a majority of the members of the Council.

CHAPTER X. THE SECRETARIAT

1. There should be a secretariat, comprising a secretary general (five deputies) and such staff as may be required.

The secretary general and his deputies should be elected by the General Assembly on recommendation of the Security Council for a period of 3 years, and the secretary general should be eligible for reelection. The secretary general should be the chief administrative officer of the Organization.

2. The secretary general shall act in that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, of the Economic and Social Council, and of the Trusteeship Council, and shall perform such other functions as are or may be entrusted to him by the organization. The secretary general shall make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

3. The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which, in his opinion, might threaten international peace and security.

4. In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall be responsible only to the Organization. They shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials. Each member undertakes to respect the exclusive international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

5. The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly. The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

CHAPTER XI. RATIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS

1. (A) The present charter shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

(B) The ratification shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all signatory states of each deposit.

(C) As soon as the ratifications have been deposited by each of the states entitled to a permanent seat on the Security Council and by a majority of the other signatory states, the charter shall come into force for those states which have deposited their ratifications.

(D) The charter shall come into force for each of the other signatory states on the date of the deposit of its ratification.

2. Amendments should come into force for all members of the Organization when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by the members of the Organization having permanent membership on the Security Council and by a majority of the other members of the Organization.

3. A general conference of the members of the United Nations may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote

to the General Assembly, with the concurrence of the Security Council, voting in accordance with the provisions of chapter VI, section C, paragraph 2, for the purpose of reviewing the charter. Each member shall have 1 vote in the Conference. Any alterations of the charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the Conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by the members of the organization having permanent membership on the Security Council and by a majority of the other members of the organization.

CHAPTER XII. TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

1. Pending the coming into force of the special agreement or agreements referred to in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 5, and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of the four-nation declaration signed at Moscow October 30, 1943, the states parties to that declaration should consult with one another and, as occasion arises, with other members of the Organization with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. No provision of the charter should preclude action taken or authorized in relation to enemy states as a result of the present war by the governments having responsibility for such action.

CHAPTER XIII. MISCELLANEOUS

Section A. Legal status and immunity

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such legal capacity as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and the fulfillment of its purposes.

2. (A) The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such privileges and immunities as are necessary to the fulfillment of its purposes.

(B) Representatives of the members of the Organization and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary to the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the organization.

3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of the foregoing provisions or may propose conventions to the members of the Organization for this purpose.

Section B. Treaties and obligations

1. Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any member of the Organization after the coming into force of the charter shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and be published by it.

2. No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accord with the provisions of this article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the Organization.

3. In the event of any conflict arising between the members of the Organization under the charter and their obligations under any other international agreement the former shall prevail.

CHAPTER ON TRUSTEESHIP

Section A. General policy

1. States members of the United Nations which have responsibilities for the administration of territories inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world accept the general principle that it is a sacred trust of civilization to promote to the utmost the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories within the world community, and to this end:

(A) To insure the economic and social advancement of the peoples concerned;

(B) To develop self-government in forms appropriate to the varying circumstances of each territory; and

(C) To further international peace and security.

2. States members also agree that their policy in respect to such territories, no less than in respect to their metropolitan areas, must be based on the general principle of good-neighborliness, due account being taken of the interests and well-being of other members of the world community, in social economic and commercial matters.

Section B. Territorial trusteeship system

1. The Organization should establish under its authority an international system of trusteeship for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements and set up suitable machinery for these purposes.

2. The basic objective of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the purposes of the Organization laid down in chapter I of the charter, should be:

(A) To further international peace and security;

(B) To promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the trust territories and their inhabitants and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the trusteeship arrangement;

(C) To encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex, and recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

(D) To insure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations, and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of (A) and (B) above, and subject to the provisions of paragraph 5 below.

3. The trusteeship system should apply only to such territories in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship arrangements:

(a) Territories now held under mandate;

(b) Territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of this war; and

(c) Territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration. It would be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories would be brought under a trusteeship system and upon what terms. The trusteeship system should not apply to territories which have become members of the United Nations.

4. The trusteeship arrangement for each territory to be under trusteeship should be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by one of the United Nations, and should be approved as provided for in paragraphs 8 and 10 below.

5. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship arrangements, made under paragraphs 3, 4, and 6, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which member states may respectively be parties. This paragraph should not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of the agreements for placing mandated and other territories, as provided for in paragraph 3, under the trusteeship system.

6. The trusteeship arrangements in each case should include the terms under which the territory will be administered and designate the state which should exercise the administration of the territory or designate the United Nations Organization itself to exercise the administration of the territory.

7. In addition, there may also be designated, in the trusteeship arrangement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the territory to which the arrangement applies, without prejudice to any special agreements made under chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 5.

8. All functions of the Organization relative to such strategic areas, including the approval of the trusteeship arrangements and their alteration or amendment, should be exercised by the Security Council. The basic objectives as provided for in paragraph B.2 above should be applicable to the people of each strategic area. The Security Council shall without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the trusteeship council provided for in paragraph 11 below to perform these functions of the organization under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, and social matters in the strategic areas, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship arrangements.

9. It shall be the duty of the state administering any trust territory to insure that the territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the state shall be empowered to make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the territory in carrying out the obligation undertaken by the state for the Security Council in this regard and for local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the territory.

10. The functions of the Organization with regard to trusteeship arrangements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the trusteeship arrangements and their alteration and amendment should be exercised by the General Assembly.

11. In order to assist the General Assembly to carry out those functions under the trusteeship system not reserved to the Security Council, there should be established a trusteeship council which would operate under its authority. The trusteeship council should consist of specially qualified representatives, designated (A) one each by the States administering trust territories and (B) one each by the states named in chapter VI, section A, which are not administering trust territories; and (C) one each by a sufficient number of other states, namely for 3-year periods by the General Assembly, so that the total number of representatives is equally divided between administering and nonadministering states. The trusteeship council shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the Economic and Social Council and of other bodies which are brought into relationship with the United Nations Organization, in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

12. The General Assembly, and under its authority, the trusteeship council, in carrying out their functions, should be empowered to consider reports submitted by the administering state, to accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering state, to make periodic visits to the respective territories at times agreed upon with the administering state, and to take these and other actions in conformity with the trusteeship arrangements.

13. The administering authority in each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly should make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of a questionnaire formulated by the trusteeship council, on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territory.

EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATIONS OF THE FOUR SPONSORING GOVERNMENTS ON VOTING PROCEDURE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

(Released in San Francisco, Calif., June 8, 1945)

Specific questions covering the voting procedure in the Security Council have been submitted by a subcommittee of the Conference Committee on Structure and Procedures of the Security Council to the delegations of the four Governments sponsoring the Conference—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Republic of China. In dealing with these questions, the four delegations desire to make the following statement of their general attitude toward the whole question of unanimity of permanent members in the decisions of the Security Council:

1. The Yalta voting formula recognizes that the Security Council, in discharging its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, will have two broad groups of functions. Under chapter VIII, the Council will have to make decisions which involve its taking direct measures in connection with settlement of disputes, adjustment of situations likely to lead to disputes, determination of threats to the peace, removal of threats to the peace, and suppression of breaches of the peace. It will also have to make decisions which do not involve the taking of such measures. The Yalta formula provides that the second of these two groups of decisions will be governed by a procedural vote—that is, the vote of any seven members. The first group of decisions will be governed by a qualified vote—that is, the vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the five permanent members, subject to the proviso that in decisions under section A and a part of section C of Chapter VIII parties to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

2. For example, under the Yalta formula a procedural vote will govern the decisions made under the entire section D, of chapter VI. This means that the Council will, by a vote of any seven of its members, adopt or alter its rules of procedure; determine the method of selecting its president; organize itself in such a way as to be able to function continuously; select the times and places of its regular and special meetings; establish such bodies or agencies as it may deem necessary for the performance of its functions; invite a member of the Organization not represented on the Council to participate in its discussions when the members' interests are specifically affected; and invite any state when it is a party to a dispute being considered by the Council to participate in the discussion relating to that dispute.

3. Further, no individual member of the Council can alone prevent consideration and discussion by the Council of a dispute or situation brought to its attention under paragraph 2, section A, chapter VIII. Nor can parties to such dispute be prevented by these means from being heard by the Council. Likewise, the requirement for unanimity of the permanent members cannot prevent any member of the Council from reminding the members of the organization of their general obligations assumed under the Charter as regards peaceful settlement of international disputes.

4. Beyond this point, decisions and actions by the Security Council may well have major political consequences and may even initiate a chain of events which might, in the end, require the Council under its responsibilities to invoke measures of enforcement under Section B, Chapter VIII. This chain of events begins when the Council decides to

make an investigation, or determines that the time has come to call upon states to settle their differences, or makes recommendations to the parties. It is to such decisions and actions that unanimity of the permanent members applies, with the important proviso, referred to above, for abstention from voting by parties to a dispute.

5. To illustrate: In ordering an investigation, the Council has to consider whether the investigation—which may involve calling for reports, hearing witnesses, dispatching a commission of inquiry, or other means—might not further aggravate the situation. After investigation, the Council must determine whether the continuance of the situation or dispute would be likely to endanger international peace and security. If it so determines, the Council would be under obligation to take further steps. Similarly, the decision to make recommendations, even when all parties request it to do so, or to call upon parties to a dispute to fulfill their obligations under the Charter, might be the first step on a course of action from which the Security Council could withdraw only at the risk of failing to discharge its responsibilities.

6. In appraising the significance of the vote required to take such decisions or actions, it is useful to make comparison with the requirements of the League Covenant with reference to decisions of the League Council. Substantive decisions of the League of Nations Council could be taken only by the unanimous vote of all its members, whether permanent or not, with the exception of parties to a dispute under article XV of the League Covenant. Under article XI, under which most of the disputes brought before the League were dealt with and decisions to make investigations taken, the unanimity rule was invariably interpreted to include even the votes of the parties to a dispute.

7. The Yalta voting formula substitutes for the rule of complete unanimity of the League Council a system of qualified majority voting in the Security Council. Under this system nonpermanent members of the Security Council individually would have no veto. As regards the permanent members, there is no question under the Yalta formula of investing them with a new right, namely, the right to veto, a right which the permanent members of the League Council always had. The formula proposed for the taking of action in the Security Council by a majority of seven would make the operation of the Council less subject to obstruction than was the case under the League of Nations rule of complete unanimity.

8. It should also be remembered that under the Yalta formula the five major powers could not act by themselves, since even under the unanimity requirement any decisions of the Council would have to include the concurring votes of at least two of the nonpermanent members. In other words, it would be possible for five nonpermanent members as a group to exercise a veto. It is not to be assumed, however, that the permanent members, any more than the nonpermanent members, would use their veto power willfully to obstruct the operation of the Council.

9. In view of the primary responsibilities of the permanent members, they could not be expected, in the present condition of the world, to assume the obligation to act, in so serious a matter as the maintenance of international peace and security in consequence of a decision in which they had not concurred. Therefore, if majority voting in the Security Council is to be made possible, the only practicable method is to provide, in respect of nonprocedural decisions, for unanimity of the permanent members plus the concurring votes of at least two of the nonpermanent members.

10. For all these reasons, the four sponsoring governments agreed on the Yalta formula and have presented it to this Conference as essential if an international organization is to be created through which all peace-loving nations can effectively discharge their common responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the junior Senator from Ohio with regard to the address he made earlier in the day. Unfortunately I had to be away while he was discussing that portion of his address regarding the amending clause of the Charter of San Francisco. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will give the Senate his views on whether it would be proper to have a revision convention—we will say a constitutional convention—for the revision of that Charter in 5 or 7 years as an alternative to making the Charter more easily amended.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, replying to the Senator from Arkansas, I will say that I did discuss that matter in my statement earlier in the day, and I said I concurred in what is apparently the proposal now pending in San Francisco that there be provision made for amending the Charter in somewhat the same way that we amend the Constitution of the United States, either by convention or by submission of individual amendments, and my thought is that following the precedent in the Constitution of the United States, the time for calling a general conference for amending the Charter should not be set now for a specific date, because it might be an unfortunate and inconvenient date, but should be left to the call of some proportion, let us say about two-thirds of the assembly, or three-fourths of the assembly, and then a meeting of the general conference could be held, and action taken by way of convention or by way of individual amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to say that my purpose in asking the question was to ascertain the Senator's view, and to place on record my own view, which is, that I believe the most important thing that now can be done by the Charter is to make it more easily amended, or subject to revision at some reasonably future time, during which we shall have had the experience necessary to develop the understanding which will be required to remedy some of the defects which all of us note.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. The point I should like to add, simply to make sure that the colloquy is clear, is that the one thing which is most discouraging about the proposal now pending for amendments to the Charter is that it requires amendments to be approved by all of the permanent members of the Security Council, thereby securing a veto right to any one of them to veto any of the amendments. I think that the right to veto an amendment should be limited to those provisions of the original Charter dealing with the veto.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I absolutely agree, and I hope our delegation will insist upon

that point. That is what I meant by saying there should be a liberalization of the amending power.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3240) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hart	Murdock
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltanall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Downey	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wilson
George	Moore	
Gerry	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3306, the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Appropriations. There is no controversy respecting it, and I am confident it can be passed in 10 or 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield for that purpose?

Mr. GEORGE. I will yield for that purpose, Mr. President, with the understanding that consideration of the bill will take but a short time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3306) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say first that the appropriations for the District of Columbia last year amounted to \$69,827,963. The Senate

Appropriations Committee added \$715,200 to the amount of the pending appropriation bill as passed by the House, but even with that addition the total of the bill, as reported to the Senate, is only \$65,703,280, or \$4,124,688 less than the appropriations for last year. The bulk of the addition which was made by the Senate committee is for public schools, \$518,560. The other additions are of a minor character.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Fiscal service," on page 5, line 20, after the word "laws", to strike out "\$220,000" and insert "227,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Regulatory agencies," on page 8, line 14, after the figures "\$128,100", to insert a comma and "together with not to exceed \$6,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 3, after the words "rest room", to strike out "\$145,300" and insert "\$148,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public schools—Operating expenses," on page 10, line 15, after the word "denies", to strike out "equal privileges", and in line 16, after the word "children", to strike out "as is" and insert "the same treatment as that."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Capital outlay," on page 15, after line 18, to insert:

For an additional amount for the construction of an eight-room addition to the Kimball School, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, remodeling of the present building, and treatment of grounds, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 22, to insert:

For the construction of a 16-room extensible elementary-school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, and treatment of grounds, in the vicinity of Fifty-third and Blaine Streets NE., \$430,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 16, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for a new 24-room elementary-school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, to replace the present Amidon, Fairbrother, and Greenleaf Schools, to be constructed at a total cost of not to exceed \$500,000, on a site in the vicinity of the Amidon School, \$10,500, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 24, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for a new 24-room elementary-school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, to replace the present Walker and Jones Schools, to be constructed at a total cost not to exceed \$500,000, on a site in the vicinity of Third and L Streets NW., \$10,500, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 7, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for a new 14-room elementary-school building, including an assembly hall-gymnasium, to replace the present Peabody and Hilton Schools, to be constructed at a total cost not to exceed \$360,000, on a site in the vicinity of the Peabody School, \$7,560, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 19, after the words "In all", to strike out "\$1,608,000" and insert "\$2,126,560"; in line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "which amount may be credited to the appropriation account 'Office of Municipal Architect, construction services'"; and in line 24, after the word "schools" and the quotation mark, to strike out the comma and "but obligations shall not be incurred for any or all of the foregoing projects which would result in a total obligation in excess of such \$1,608,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Library," on page 20, line 19, after the name "Woodridge" to strike out "\$679,000" and insert "\$682,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 5, to insert:

For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of branch library buildings in Anacostia and Pleasant Plains, and for remodeling of existing structures at Takoma Park and Southeastern, \$17,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming where, if anywhere in this bill, the matter of pay for janitors or custodians of schools appears?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 11, the paragraph beginning on line 1, under the item "Operation of buildings and maintenance of equipment," includes the appropriation for that sort of service. There is no special treatment given in this bill to pay for janitors.

Mr. LANGER. My information is that the pay is totally inadequate. Some Janitors are receiving \$1,200, \$1,300, or \$1,400 a year, depending upon how long they have been in the service. Somewhere in this bill I believe there should be a provision to raise the pay of such employees to the point where they can at least make a living.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the classification of salaries, for the most part, is a matter of legislation. The House committee, in reporting this bill included in its report a paragraph reading as follows:

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS

As previously indicated, on April 1, there were 1,292 vacancies out of a total of 12,964 authorized positions, or 10 percent. While the manpower situation has no doubt accounted for a great number of the vacancies it also has become apparent to the committee that a great portion of these vacancies may be attributed to inadequate salaries. While the committee is not in a position to make any expression as to what officials or agencies are responsible for this situation, it is of the definite opinion that something must be done about it. Either the District officials should take action or the Civil Service Commission should review the standards with respect to many of the positions, especially those in the welfare and health institutions. It is inconceivable to the committee, for instance, to expect the employment of graduate nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, doctors of medicine, and other personnel requiring college training and extensive experience at the salaries presently provided. The committee is of the opinion that fewer but better-paid personnel would result not only in better service to the residents of the District but in more efficient and economical operation.

The Appropriations Committee, either that of the Senate or that of the House, did not make any study of these salaries, the reason being that the Committees on Civil Service in both Houses and the legislative committees on the District of Columbia have that matter in mind. As I recall, the Civil Service Committee of the House has reported a bill dealing with the whole question of personnel compensation. The Appropriations Committee is rather limited in its consideration of salary rates and classifications, because that is a legislative matter, which should properly be considered by a legislative committee. Under the rules, we would find it very difficult to pass appropriation bills at all if we were to undertake broad legislative projects. Of course, compensation of employees would be such a project.

Mr. LANGER. As I remember, at various times the Committee on the District of Columbia has reported bills covering the pay of policemen and firemen, which bills have been passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They were considered and reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Such matters come under the jurisdiction of a legislative committee. We are dealing in this instance with appropriations. The Senator will recall that the rules of the Senate provide that legislation shall not be attached to an appropriation bill except on written notice and suspension of the rule. The problem which the Senator raises is a problem for the consideration of the Committee on the District of Columbia, because a law would have to be enacted. We undertake in this bill only to provide appropriations to make effective laws which have already been enacted.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand from what the Senator says, a point of order could be raised against any amendment to fix the salaries of janitors and custodians.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The Committee on Appropriations does not believe that that is its function.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health Department," on page 30, line 19, after the words "per annum", to strike out "each and" and insert "each"; in line 20, after the word "each", to insert a comma and "and one chief steward at \$3,600 per annum"; on page 31, line 7, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$1,750,000" and insert "\$1,828,320"; and in line 17, after the word "or", to strike out "in the diagnosis of tuberculosis" and insert "where the Commissioners determine it to be necessary in the public interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public welfare—Family welfare service," on page 33, line 13, after the word "than", to strike out "\$1,689" and insert "\$3,360"; in line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "four" and insert "eight"; and on page 34, line 3, after the word "building", to strike out "\$556,000" and insert "\$557,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Juvenile correctional service," on page 37, line 12, after the word "committed", to strike out "\$390,000" and insert "\$385,740."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming where, on page 33, any provision is made for aged people?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from North Dakota will observe that, beginning on page 32, the bill deals with public-welfare items. The provision for old-age assistance is to be found on page 34, beginning in line 15, under the item "Adult assistance: For all expenses necessary for certification," and so forth. I will say to the Senator that provision was made in the bill as it passed the House, apparently quite satisfactory to all concerned, because although full notice was given of the public hearing by the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, no representations were made on that score.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell us how much a month an aged person receives in the District of Columbia?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I correctly remember, a year ago there were ceilings on the amount of individual aid that could be given to any single person. Last year the Senate committee, in considering the District of Columbia appropriation bill, felt that that was unjustified, that the ceilings were too low, and that they should not be imposed, but that the welfare authorities should be free to meet each situation as it arose. We, therefore, recommended an amend-

ment which the Senate adopted, taking the ceilings off. So it is altogether within the jurisdiction of the welfare authorities to pay what each case deserves.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me what the average is?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not carry that figure in my mind. The hearings in the House, on page 313, contain this exchange:

Mr. STEFAN. The ceiling for fiscal 1943 compared with February 1945 for old-age assistance: 1943 was \$30; 1945, \$34.52. You have this table?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes, we prepared the table, and I have a copy of it here.

Mr. LANGER. That is the maximum. What is the minimum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not have those figures here. It would be altogether unrealistic, however, to cite a minimum, because it might be a very small amount made for a particular case. I think the authorities of the District of Columbia are taking adequate care of the problem as it arises. Certainly no complaint was made to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, \$34, if that is a ceiling, would not be very much.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not a ceiling. The ceilings have been taken off.

Mr. LANGER. They have been taken off?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and it was due to the action of the Senate last year that they were taken off.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public works," on page 42, line 14, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$340,000" and insert "\$346,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 12, after the word "education", to insert "without reference to any other law"; in line 13, before the word "Provided", to strike out "\$396,200" and insert "\$465,600"; and on page 50, line 9, after the word "shall", to insert "hereafter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital Parks", on page 58, line 14, after the word "wagons", to strike out "\$936,000" and insert "\$948,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Zoological Park," on page 59, line 9, after the word "specimens", to strike out "purchase, maintenance," and insert "purchase of one additional passenger-carrying vehicle, and maintenance."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 18, after the name "Commissioners of the District of Columbia", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That officers and employees whose positions were reallocated by the Civil Service Commission during the period January 1, 1945, to July 1, 1945, who have not received such reallocation increases shall be entitled to receive them retroactively to the date they would otherwise have been effective except for the provisions of said section

7, but in no case prior to January 1, 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 24, to insert:

SEC. 10. Appropriations herein made available for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles, with the exception of those to be purchased for use by the Fire Department and the Metropolitan Police, shall be available only for the purchase of used or Federal surplus motor vehicles.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 5, to change the section number from 10 to 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by instruction of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 13, following the word "Provided", it is proposed to insert the following: "That \$25,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1945 shall be available for payment to the National Symphony Orchestra Association for concerts to be given in the public schools of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1946 when a program satisfactory to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia has been arranged: *Provided further*."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 24, after the word "waived", under the paragraph "Municipal court", it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided further, That hereafter the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the clerk of the court, upon requisition previously approved by the Auditor of the District of Columbia, sums of money not exceeding \$500 at any one time, to be used for the payment of witness fees."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and is open to further amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on page 37, under the heading "Juvenile correctional service," I notice the item for the National Training School for Girls. Let me inquire whether the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls is a man or a woman?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Superintendent is a woman.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the bill provides for her a salary of only \$3,200. That would seem to be entirely inadequate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that his point of view has been shared by some members of the committee. That amount represents an increase of \$500 over the amount the Superintendent formerly received. I will say to the Senator that the whole problem of the National Training School for Girls is the subject of special consideration by the subcommittee. There are on foot plans to provide better facilities, and there has also been a suggestion, on the part of at least one member of the committee, that the expense of running the school is altogether out of proportion to the number of its inmates.

The President pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words in expressing appreciation of the efficiency with which the committee staff and the subcommittee staff and the chairman of the subcommittee have handled these matters. The hearings on this appropriation bill were conducted with a great deal of expedition. It appears from a consideration of the House committee report and from the hearings before the Senate committee that much care has been given to this bill in all its details. The total increase in the amounts of the appropriations, as recommended by the subcommittee and as explained by the Senator from Wyoming, consists almost entirely of amounts for the building of two schools and the making of plans for certain other schools. I wish to point out that those additions are not variations from the District's program. They are part of a well-established and thoroughly planned program which has been developed over a period of years by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who brought about a study of the school system of the District of Columbia with a view to building up the school facilities without borrowing money by the issuance of bonds, but by providing for a reasonable addition of new buildings to the school system from year to year.

What is proposed here is merely the continuance of a well-planned and established program. The provision for the schools which is added in the bill is in accordance with the result of exhaustive research to determine which ones are needed under the program, in view of the changing conditions in the District of Columbia. I think there is no question that these additions should be made, and I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I join the junior Senator from Ohio in his compliment to the staff of the Appropriations Committee. In the handling of this bill, as in the handling of other appropriation bills, the staff has been most helpful to the members of the committee.

I should say, in addition, that no member of the committee is more diligent, more helpful, or more effective than the Senator from Ohio. He has been very helpful in his service on this committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 3306) was passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GLASS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BILBO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BALL, and Mr. WILLIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I find that it is necessary for me to be absent for a week or so in my home State. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for approximately the next 2 weeks, if I find it necessary to remain that long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3109. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3267. An act to further extend the effectiveness of the act approved December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3240) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the hour is late, and perhaps it will be just as well not to begin lengthy consideration of the pending bill until tomorrow. However, I shall make a brief statement concerning the renewal of the trade-agreements legislation and the action taken by the committee on it.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 authorizes a modification of not more than 50 percent in rates and duties in effect at the time of its passage. The bill now before the Senate, as it came from the House of Representatives, makes the legislation apply to tariff duties in effect as of January 1, 1945. It sets up the same machinery or continues the same machinery and the same safeguards, and it contains certain provisions which are applicable to the change made in the grant of the power to the President. It adds to the reviewing committee on

which the President must call for advice and information, two additional departments of Government, to wit, the War Department and the Navy Department.

The President, under the original act, and under each extension of it, was authorized to call upon the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and the Tariff Commission for information and advice. But now, under section 4 of the pending bill, as it came from the other House, and as it was reported by the Finance Committee to the Senate, the War Department and the Navy Department have been added. Obviously, the real purpose in adding the War and Navy Departments is to have before the President at all times, when any trade agreement is under consideration, the necessities of the Army and Navy for strategic materials and metals.

When the bill was considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate, on motion of the Senator from Ohio section 2 of the bill; that is, the section which would give authority to the President to modify by not more than 50 percent up or down, the existing rates, namely, the rates in effect on January 1, 1945, was stricken out, and all other provisions relating to the enlargement of the power of the President were stricken from the bill as well.

Section 3 was also stricken from the bill, but paragraph 3 of that section was reinserted in the same form in which it came from the House.

No other amendments were made in House bill 3240 by the Senate Finance Committee.

In this particular instance, Mr. President, I find myself in this position: I am not able to go along with the majority of the committee in striking section 2 from the bill, and I gave notice that I would reserve the right to insist before the Senate, as a Member of this body and as a member of the Senate committee, that the amendment be disagreed to rather than approved by the Senate. In connection with that point I may say that the vote in the Finance Committee was 10 in favor of striking section 2 from the bill, and 9 against striking it. Two members of the committee were absent in attendance at the San Francisco Conference, and did not vote.

Mr. President, several other amendments were considered, but were rejected. I refer particularly to an amendment to shorten the period of the extension from 3 to 2 years.

With the exceptions already stated, the bill remains in the same form as when it came to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I shall not enter into any lengthy discussion of the bill at this time, and perhaps not at any time, because the issues joined are very clear and are very well known to the Members of the Senate. I shall make only a few observations which I think should be made.

Undoubtedly, during the discussion of the measure many extraordinary arguments will be advanced for and against the proposal. They will be arguments

which will reduce themselves to a pure contest between a percentage ad valorem and specific duties upon particular products. If that were all the bill meant it should not have been brought before the Senate to consume the time of the Senate. If the primary purpose of the bill were merely to afford a contest over certain tariff rates, it would not be worth while to consider it.

The Trade Agreements Act was originally enacted, it is true, for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States, by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets would be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States. The general purpose of the act, of course, remains the same, but circumstances and events have widened the act vastly in the course of the past few years. At the present time the act itself is far more important than it has been at any time since its enactment, because it not only retains the original purpose for which it was enacted—we have had 10 or 11 years of experience under the act—but the events which have occurred since its original enactment have tremendously increased the importance of the legislation.

Whatever Members of this body may think, or whatever Members of the other House may think, the act has been lifted entirely out of the field of mere controversy as to whether there should be a 55-cent duty or a 40-cent duty, or whether there should be a reduction or increase in tariff rates.

Mr. President, what has transpired accounts for the importance of this legislation. Bear in mind that I have not, and I do not intend to take the position that the whole peace of mankind depends on this legislation. Not at all. I am thinking of this bill as I think of every other bill, namely, from the standpoint of our American economy, what will happen to us and how it will affect us. I also have due regard, I hope, for the welfare and well-being of peoples everywhere insofar as our domestic legislation of any character is concerned which may affect their welfare and their well-being.

I shall not make the extravagant statement, and do not intend to be led into any statement that with this measure in force and effect, imports into this country and exports from it may be increased to any arbitrarily high figure. I think I have sufficient judgment to know that the final limitation of imports into this country is fixed by our capacity to receive and to consume them. I believe that the American economy has a right to such imports as it can receive and beneficially consume. I can conceive of no one who would wish to contradict the statement I have made.

Mr. President, this is not a mere tariff issue any longer, and I am now coming to what I wish to say, and perhaps all I wish to say this afternoon. The world has very steadily moved toward collec-

tivism, and it is still moving in that direction, and regardless of whether any individual or any political party in America grasps the effect of that movement, the movement goes on anyway, relentlessly at this moment. The world is moving definitely in that direction. All of Europe is moving in that direction. The pressure upon the one single power in Europe, as we associate it with Europe, which might stand against it, is the United Kingdom, the British Empire, and already unmistakable evidences exist that Britain herself is being moved in that direction.

There will be an election in Great Britain which will of course at this time mean the election of Mr. Churchill and his party, but that election may not stand for longer than 9 months. Anyone who will carefully read Mr. Churchill's party declaration I think will see what I mean. I shall read what he said, in part. This is the manifesto issued by Mr. Churchill and the Conservative Party, on which he is asking for reelection:

Britain will not give up its right to safeguard our balance of payments by whatever means are necessary.

That is the declaration of the British Premier, Mr. Churchill; that is the declaration that state control of commerce will be the rule of the future, if it is necessary to go that far to preserve the balance of payments of the British Empire. That, Mr. President, is all it means.

At this juncture we stand face to face with an issue which looms larger than any tariff, that is, whether we are to have trading by private individuals through the channels of world commerce, or whether it is to be a collectivist program. In all Europe the movement is toward collectivism. The single influence in the great international trading communities of the earth which would stand against it ordinarily must be the British Empire; yet the British Empire faces facts, not theories.

The Soviet Union may regulate her own trade as she pleases, because her trade is state controlled. It is a matter which concerns the state. They may export at a loss or import at a loss, because it is all washed out in an economy which is completely state owned and state controlled.

I do not indulge in any criticism of Russia. I have carefully avoided it, and I wish to avoid it. I can see how we may cooperate with Russia, with the Soviet Union, though holding to basically and radically different social, economic, and political principles. But we of the United States should be able to see that the powerful influence of Russia will make for a collectivist economy, as far as that influence can go, and our economy, in the long run, will shape our political structure. Therefore, it seems to me, Mr. President, that at this moment we stand face to face with an issue which not only incorporates all of the purposes for which it was originally framed, but which has grown immensely larger.

If anyone is to make a fight for free trade in the sense that trade is to be carried on by individuals and organiza-

tions, and not as a mere instrumentality of the State, who is to do it? We may hope that the British Empire will be found on our side finally, because undoubtedly they know the wisdom of liberal trade policies, and have usually stood for a liberal trade program. But we cannot close our eyes to the fact that on the whole continent of Europe indeed, throughout the world, men may be asking, "Where can there be found full employment? Where can there be found an economy under which men and women are not concerned about their well-being and welfare, about what they shall eat and wear, and how they shall be sheltered?"

Mr. President, inevitably the economic system of Soviet Russia will be brought into comparison with the economic system of the United States, a free system for which we have always stood. Who is to defend it?

I have been at a loss to understand how men can talk about a reduction in the ad valorem rate on zinc, or on some other article of commerce, in the face of the fact that this issue is so much greater than that.

Now what is proposed in that part of the bill which was stricken out in the Committee on Finance by a vote of 11 to 10? It proposes to give assistance to the President of the United States in his fight for a free commerce, not in the sense of free trade, but in the sense of free commerce. Our trade with Russia has never amounted to more than about \$30,000,000, or some such negligible amount. If their economic system should prevail throughout the earth, our trade could easily shrink everywhere. If we are to have governments controlling trade and commerce of the earth, or if we are to have governments supporting cartels, and imposing restrictions, and monetary regulations, and what not, then the period of free trade in the world, in the sense of free enterprise in trade, may temporarily lapse.

So, the United States is the only great nation—I am, thank God, happy to feel justified in believing that Canada will be on our side—the United States is the only great nation, with the sympathetic support of many of our Latin-American neighbor nations to be sure, on whom it will devolve to maintain a system of free economic enterprise as applied to international trade and commerce. That is why it was sought to give to the President of the United States a little more power. He had the power under the original act to modify tariff rates of 1930 by not more than 50 percent. Already, on the basis of value, 42 percent of all our dutiable imports have been reduced by 50 percent. Twenty to twenty-two percent of dutiable imports have been reduced by a lesser percentage. Some 37 or 38 percent of our dutiable imports have not been affected by any trade agreement made under the Trade Agreements Act. But the 42 percent on which the 50-percent reduction has already been made includes practically 90 percent of the chief exports of Canada and the United Kingdom to the United States.

Germany is not the great problem in the immediate future. Not while this

extension continues for 3 years, if the measure is approved by Congress, will Germany be a strong factor in the world market. Japan will not be a factor in the world market during the next 3 or perhaps the next 7 years. Great Britain will be. She is the greatest trading country in the family of international traders. Canada will be. Canada and the United Kingdom constitute our greatest customers for our foreign trade. There is therefore little left of the bargaining power originally vested in the President under the act of 1934, indeed, actually there is almost nothing left of it, because we will do no bargaining with the Axis group. As I have just said, they will not be a factor in world commerce and world trade during the period covered by this act, if extension of it is approved by the Congress.

We will deal with those nations which have been united with us. We have the power, if we are wise, to give to the executive branch of our Government the authority to sit down and talk matters over. We may have the power to turn Britain from her present course, and even to influence Soviet Russia so far as trade restrictions are concerned. We will certainly have no power to turn them from the course on which they are now rather definitely headed if we have nothing to talk about when we sit down to bargain with them. If we are not now going to entrust the executive branch of the Government with some power and some authority, then we would be expecting the impossible from our Government in meeting the acute issues that lie ahead and that are far more important than any single duty granted to any single interest in the United States, because, in the final analysis, they embrace and include everything we have always stood for, and that is, first, the protection of our American markets, and, second, an opportunity to trade in the markets of the world without discrimination against us.

Mr. President, the tariff seems to me more and more to be a local issue, and sometimes the best of us are not able to rise above the local influences which surround us. Even if there are any interests in the country that think this further grant of power to the President may be hurtful to them it seems to me they can afford to place some weight upon the solemn promise and declaration of the President of the United States when he said:

I have had drawn to my attention statements to the effect that this increased authority might be used in such a way as to endanger or "trade out" segments of American industry, American agriculture, or American labor. No such action was taken under President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, and no such action will take place under my Presidency.

The grant here asked is of a permissive power and of a permissive authority—permissive power and authority which will enable the Executive not to save the hides of particular protected interests which cannot look beyond their own local interests when the national welfare is involved but to protect a system of free enterprise, international

trade, and commerce on which their whole future must depend.

Mr. President, I have already said that I do not expect to see our exports and imports climb to anything like the heights that some of our friends constantly tell us about, but I hope that we will be able wholesomely to increase our exports. That will, of course, make it necessary to increase our imports in order to pay for the exports, because I think we must envision an expanded economy, not a contracted economy. If we or any of us have already reached the conclusion that we face a world in which the economy will be contracting we are already admitting defeat, we are already admitting that we are headed in the direction of another great destructive catastrophe in the history of mankind.

Mr. President, I wish to read an excellent statement on this very point made by Mr. Charles Taft, who is now with the State Department. His statement is:

The fact is—and I am glad that the occasion for each renewal of the act affords an opportunity to make it clearer—that the trade-agreements law itself really has nothing to do with the traditional tariff issue. The issue is no longer the historic question of tariff for protection or tariff for revenue only. Congress has made it abundantly clear—and I think there is no difference on this between Republicans and Democrats—that it will not permit existing tariffs to be reduced to a point where any segment of American industry or agriculture would suffer serious injury. Within the bondary of this controlling policy the Trade Agreements Act is the mechanism by which individual rates of duty can be adjusted carefully and selectively, in exchange for valuable concessions from other nations, all with a view to creating the conditions in which a sound and thriving foreign commerce can be carried on.

Mr. President, during the course of the debate I shall, of course, have more to say; but I wish to repeat here and now that I shall not concern myself in any dispute, or worry myself about a slight increase in a mere trickle of imports coming into this country because of a reduction or modification that may have been made in tariff rates. As I envision this issue, it rises above the ordinary tariff dispute with which we have been familiar through the years. Events have lifted it out of that category, and have given this legislation a wider significance at this time.

I have read what the President has said, and I have read what one of the officers of the State Department who will administer the act itself has said. I am here to give assurance that I would be the first to go to the rescue of any American industry which was being sacrificed or destroyed because of any unwise application of the trade agreements law. I would not see American labor deprived of employment by any unwise application of the law.

It is quite possible that within the next 3½ years few trade agreements will actually be entered into; but this act is a powerful lever to enable us to avoid the direction which things may inevitably take in the postwar period if we are not in a position to talk with those who will make the trade policies of other nations.

The great advantage of the Trade Agreements Act has not been in what little increase it brought to a particular industry or in the case of particular products, but in breaking down the restrictions which would adversely affect all production and all trade in the United States.

It has been urged upon me, as I know it has been urged upon other Senators and will continue to be urged upon them, that now is not the time to extend the act. The argument is that in this period of flux and change, the European War having ended and the Japanese War approaching—as we hope—a reasonably early end, now is not the time to be dealing with tariffs or anything that may affect or modify tariff rates. I assert that now is the time, because within 3 years the trade policies of every important country on the globe will have been set. Whether they will be set adversely to us or not, we do not know. Great Britain is getting ready to return to civilian production. France will do so as soon as she can obtain sufficient coal and raw materials. The Soviet Union will go into production on a large scale. While she is not interested in commerce in the same way that we are, she is nevertheless interested in production. All the other countries of Europe will be going back into production at the earliest possible time.

Although the world is in chaos and confusion, that very fact will hasten the arrangements which every trading nation will make in what it conceives to be the interest of its own commerce, its own industry, and the employment of its own workers within its boundaries.

If we wait for 3 years to do anything about it—and all we can do about it is in this act—the commerce of the world will be rigidly set; and if we have no way of bargaining and entering the picture within that length of time, take my word for it, Mr. President, it will be set against the free enterprise system as we have applied it to our international trade and commerce.

What the world needs now more than ever in its history is a long era of unbroken peace and of reasonably unfettered commerce. If that is not achieved, the world will face more difficult problems, perhaps, than we are now facing.

How are we going to do anything about the tariff? How are we going to meet any problem which arises within the next three and a half years with respect to any duty if we do not do it under this act. We do not expect general tariff legislation. We know that we are not going to have it. We know that it is not possible to bring about any substantial or material changes in existing schedules within the next three and a half years. We know that within the next three and a half years we are not going to have any general legislation dealing with quotas and restrictions, or any of the other things which may be builded like road blocks in the path of human progress. We must operate under this act, if at all.

I am merely speaking frankly. Is anybody willing that for the next 3 years

we shall have no agency of Government and no power in Government to deal with the problems which must inevitably affect not only our economy but the economy of the whole world and the political structures which will be erected on the economies of other nations?

It is said that Congress can do this, or that. Mr. President, I participated in the 1928-29-30 tariff debates. We spent more than 20 months on the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. There will not be another general revision of tariffs which will not take almost that long. Whatever may happen to the Senate as a result of the 1946 election, and whatever may happen to the House of Representatives, the executive branch of this Government will not change; and under this act alone is it possible for your country and mine to combat the adverse tendencies and the powerful drive to take control, largely by collectivist measures, of the future commerce of the world.

Mr. President, will any of us bind the hands of our Government for 3 years while the world is undergoing a revolution that will leave it a different world at the end of that time? In no single phase of human activity will changes more definite and more certain and more rigid be made than in the field of international trade and commerce.

This issue is not a party one. It is not a question of high or low tariffs. The single question now is whether events have lifted this legislation to a higher realm, where—after all—its approval, with slightly increased power given to the President, will constitute the only real tool with which our country can work in trying to shape at least the foundations for the future welfare of our industries and our workers.

There may be those who believe—although I have great difficulty in thinking so—that foreign trade is of no consequence. If anyone wishes to build around himself a Chinese wall and try it out, he is welcome to do so. But if our system of economy and our political system are to have any chance to survive in the world, it is of consequence, and in the years ahead of us it will be of increasing consequence, that free enterprise in the field of international trade and commerce shall play, as it must, a larger part than it has played in the past. I am tremendously heartened when I talk to men like Daniel Tobin, who represents labor—and organized labor, at that—and when all of the representatives of the CIO who come before the Finance Committee say, "We endorse this program. We have changed our position on it. We are convinced that it is a necessary and a right program." I am tremendously heartened that at least United States Senators will not tie the arms of the only branch of the American Government which can meet the problems ahead of us in the next 3 years, and thus will not leave us exposed to economic conditions and systems which may be adverse to our own and which will make it impossible for us again to extend our trade and commerce in the world on the basis on which we have enjoyed international trade and commerce in the past.

Mr. President, the hour is late, and I may not say anything more about the

bill, except with respect to particular phases of it. At this point I wish to place in the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann. I do not always agree with Walter Lippmann, but this article is a very sensible one. In it Mr. Lippmann points out that this issue is not a question of high tariffs or free trade. The article appears in today's Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE SENATE AND MR. CHURCHILL

Mr. Churchill's election manifesto, or party platform, contains a statement about British commercial policy which the Senate is bound to consider carefully. On this subject, Mr. Churchill was certainly speaking for all British parties and not solely for the Conservative Party. The manifesto says that Britain will not give up its right "to safeguard our balance of payments by whatever means are necessary." To this situation—not British alone—and to this pledge and threat the trade agreements bill and the Bretton Woods bill—both of which have been passed by the House and are now before the Senate—are addressed.

They are important, and they are urgent because the need to safeguard the balance of payments will, if we do not intervene, lead the British to commit themselves to government management of international commerce. Without the bargaining power which the trade agreements bill and Bretton Woods give us, we could not even argue with the British about the desirability of preserving the system of private enterprise in world commerce. With those measures we can talk and we can be listened to, and we may have good hope of keeping Britain—the greatest of the international trading communities—from taking the definite and perhaps irrevocable turn toward barter, restrictions, monopoly, and government control.

To ignore this paramount consideration, and to discuss the trade-agreements bill as if it were a bill to lower the American tariff, is to miss the whole point. If this were a bill to lower the American tariff, it would be a waste of precious time and energy to debate it now. There are dozens and dozens of things of far more importance than whether the tariff duty on a few imports is a little higher or a little lower. But this is not a bill to lower the American tariff. It is a bill to invest the President, who conducts our foreign relations, with economic bargaining power to be used in inducing the trading nations not to abandon but to restore and preserve the system of private trading.

What some of the opposition have quite evidently not understood is how we could use access to our market as a bargaining instrument, and yet run no risk whatever of hurting American producers. The answer is that the American economy is so much bigger than any other, is indeed about equal to all other national economies combined. That being the case, exports which fill a trifling percentage of the huge American market are of great economic importance in the much smaller economies of other nations. That is the reason why tariff adjustments which do not injure American producers have nevertheless such great international bargaining value.

It is as a bargaining instrument to promote and preserve the system of private trading that the trade-agreements bill has been conceived. That is how the instrument will be used by President Truman and by the officials—particularly Messrs. Clayton, Acheson, and Charles Taft—who are responsible

for shaping our foreign-trade policy. It is hard to believe that the Senate will deny to the American Government the means to use its own economic power to further the trade policies which all Americans, who are not advanced collectivists, believe in. For the Republicans, after all they have had to say about private enterprise, to stand out against such a measure to restore private enterprise in international trade, is as if the Anti-Saloon League started to give a series of cocktail parties.

It makes no sense whatever except that it demonstrates that most of the Republicans in Congress respond to local pressures, in this case grossly exaggerated and, except in small details, largely mistaken. The national leaders of the Republican Party have shown that they know perfectly well that the congressional Republicans have taken the wrong line, and that the party can get nowhere in the Nation as long as in Congress it follows Messrs. MARTIN and TAFT rather than its national leaders.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am tremendously impressed with what the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee has said, but I am puzzled about one point. From the Senator's remarks I have received the impression that the Soviet Union has a form of enterprise which is to be contrasted with the American and the British forms. I ask this question because I am completely ignorant of the subject matter. I am not ashamed to say so, because I do not believe that the election of a man to the office of Senator of the United States automatically clothes him with knowledge of everything. If the impression I have received from the Senator's remarks is the correct one, I cannot understand why the United States Government should lend Russia \$6,000,000,000, if we are to have this tremendous economic fight.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know that the United States Government has advanced Russia \$6,000,000,000. I am not quarreling with her system of enterprise; I am not quarreling with her economics; I am not raising the issue. I am saying that despite vast and basic differences in economic theory and political theory, I still can see how full cooperation with Russia is possible. I do not know what loans will be made to Russia, but I do believe that in the making of loans and in our ability to sit down and talk with Russia we may be able to preserve our own place and to protect our own general economy.

I will say to the Senator that if I were running the business—of course, I am not—I would not lend Russia \$6,000,000,000. I would set up a loan for Russia not to exceed \$1,000,000,000, and I would see that the money was spent under at least the control of some American agency which would safeguard our economy, and which would not permit the absorption of any one commodity which was in short supply in this country, to the hurt of American industry. I am inclined to think that I would not set up any loan to any nation in the amount of more than \$1,000,000,000. If it worked well, we might increase the loan later on. But certainly I would not set up a \$6,000,000,000 loan at this time.

However, that is not my responsibility, and I do not control it. I wish the Sen-

ator to know that I am expressing only my own view.

Mr. LINGER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I am anxious to cooperate with Russia and with every other nation. I am one of those who believe that under no consideration should we have any trouble or difficulty with Russia or any other country. However, in listening to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I have been impressed with the fact that Russia does not wish to obtain from us \$6,000,000,000 worth of shoes or clothing or food, but she wishes, as I understand the situation—and I am sure the Senator from Georgia is much better informed about it than I am—to obtain from us machines with which to make machines to manufacture goods which ultimately, in 5 or 10 years, would be in competition with goods produced in our country.

Mr. GEORGE. I cannot answer the Senator as to that.

Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. C'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield? and if so, to whom?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to ask if the Senator has any knowledge whether the United States, as a Government, has made any loans to Russia, other than those made by way of lend-lease. Is it not a fact that Russia's loans have been negotiated through private banks in this country?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no knowledge other than that which every other Senator has on that subject.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not true that prior to the war Russia was an important customer of our industries, and that our industries now have on hand very large orders from Russia, to be filled in the postwar period? So far as I know, the United States has not made any direct governmental loans to the Russian Government.

Mr. GEORGE. It has not, so far as I know, except as may have occurred under the lend-lease program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest to the Senator, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota, that there has been a great deal of comment in the press and in other places about a \$6,000,000,000 loan to Russia. No such loan has been made, and no part of it has been made. Whether Russia will ask for any such loan, I do not know.

Advances have been made to Russia under lend-lease which will, of course, be discontinued. They were war measures and not economic measures for times of peace. All that, however, lies in the future. I do not know the size of the loan for which Russia will ask. How much of it will be granted, I do not know. But up to the present time no Governmental loans have been made by the United States to Russia. There have been some private loans made to her, which extend back over a period of many years prior to the war. It should be said in connection with that fact that in no instance has Russia ever defaulted in her payments on what she borrowed from private

sources in the United States, even before she might have been said to enjoy solidity or solidarity of her political economy, a condition which she has demonstrated in this war that she possesses. I think that her meeting her obligations in this country has established for her a credible record. What will happen between Russia and the United States in regard to credits advanced in the future I do not know. It is generally understood that whatever credits she may be able to obtain will be used in the United States. Perhaps some of them will be used for the purchase of machinery. Those who are acquainted with Russia know that she needs vast industries. Mr. Stalin was said to have remarked not long ago, in regard to competition with the United States, that it would require a hundred years for Russia to be able to supply her own demands, and therefore there was no immediate danger that Russia would undermine the trade of other countries.

Russia has one-sixth of the earth's surface and one-tenth of the world's population. She has no highways worthy of the name. She has been able to industrialize in part only through the assistance of American credit and American engineers in the past quarter of a century. Russia must go a vast distance before she can offer a great menace, in my judgment, to us in international trade.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make the statement that I do not intend to be drawn into any discussion with regard to Russia. I have a very definite conviction that the system of the Russian economy may powerfully influence future trade relationships. That is the only phase of the situation which I wish to discuss.

I do not know what loans have been made to Russia, or promised to her. I merely said that if I were in control of the granting of loans, which I am not, I would not grant a loan of more than \$1,000,000,000 to any single nation for rehabilitation purposes. I do not know that additional loans should not be established, but initially I think this country would make a great mistake in making loans of from \$6,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000 to any country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia a question or two before he takes his seat.

I believe that all the remaining Members of the Senate will agree with me in my assertion that no Member of this body is more powerful or more persuasive than is the distinguished Senator from Georgia. When he applies his logic and his eloquence to any subject most of us are likely to back away from any controversy with him.

I was impressed, however, by two statements which the Senator made. First, with respect to dangers which might be incurred by industry in the United States, the Senator from Georgia stated that if any American industry were to be destroyed or injured he would be willing to come to its aid. Of course, he would. I know he would. A little later he said that in the absence of this

law the Government of the United States would be without any instrument with which to protect itself and the people of the United States in controversies which might arise with great trading nations such as Great Britain—I remember his words clearly—and with the communistic theory of trade and government. I asked the Senator how would it be possible for him, or for any Member of the Senate, or any Member of the House of Representatives to come to the assistance of any American industry once we give up our power to look at these agreements after they are made. I confess to the Senator that it seems to me to be idle for a Member of Congress to say, "I shall defend American industry against unwise trade agreement" when, by the very terms of this bill we surrender every item of power which we have in order to protect American industry. Under this bill the authority of the Congress to fix tariff rates is dedicated to the experts of the State Department. The trade agreement will be sealed, signed, and delivered before any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House knows what is in it. How, then, can we talk about defending any industry.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Wyoming has completely disarmed me by his complimentary statement, and I should be disposed to agree with him if I could, but, unfortunately, in this case I cannot.

In the first place, this agreement would last only 3 years from this date if approved. All agreements made under it would last not longer than 3 years from the date on which they were entered into. The time may be much shorter, but not greater than 3 years.

In the second place, we have the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and now, under this present bill, the War and Navy Departments, sitting in with the Tariff Commission, to advise with the President before agreements are finally made. Notice is given to the general public, and I have no doubt that within the 3 years ahead of us any one of us will be able to foreknow with what country an agreement is to be made, and will have a list of the articles which may be affected.

I do not fear that the President of the United States, who has so recently occupied a seat in this body, will be willing to listen to any Senator without regard to political persuasions, or any Member of the House of Representatives on any question of tariff rate or duty which might substantially or materially hurt American industry, or those engaged in that industry as workers.

I do not believe that, as frequently as these trade agreements are brought back before the Senate and as often as we here debate the question, there need be any fear that there will be any unrealistic steps taken which will really seriously and adversely affect American industry.

Of course, as an individual Member of the Senate it will be very hard for anyone to say that he could have his will or wishes about any particular rate of duty or trade restriction. He would simply have to do the best he could.

For my part, I believe that the President of the United States will look at these trade agreements and will not approve them if he has any serious question of an adverse material effect upon any American industry.

Not only is that true, but in the Belgian agreement, which went into effect January 1, 1939, I believe, and in the latest agreement made with Mexico, and I believe also in the second agreement made with Canada, there are appropriate escape clauses which would permit the cancellation of any agreement if an adverse effect for any reason were seen to flow from the agreement itself. I have faith that the President would certainly act, and I do not think the President is so far removed, under all machinery set up for his guidance and direction, from the pulse of the American people, as to be led to continue any program which was really harmful to American industry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator's response was precisely what I anticipated it would be. It is that even though we delegate this power, no harmful result will follow, that it will be exercised wisely, that it will be exercised in the interest of the people.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that the President of the United States will do everything in his power to make certain that none of these agreements will be to the disadvantage of the people of America. The question that is raised by the pending bill, however, is not a question of the good will of any official, it is a question of fundamental congressional power.

The Senator from Georgia has well pointed out that the trade agreements which will be negotiated under the act will be negotiated in a world in which the great Government of Russia, by government action, will determine what is to be done for the people of Russia. He has well pointed out that in the new world into which we are entering we shall be compelled to transact business with collectivist states. He has pointed out that some of the nations of the world are even now preparing for the postwar world, and that is true. But what I point out is that in the bill as it has come from the committee, and in the law as it now exists, the Congress of the United States has stripped itself of all power which belongs to it under the Constitution to protect the people who sent us here, and we are forced to rely upon pleas like that made by the Senator from Georgia, "Oh, no harm will result."

Mr. President, the great issue of our time is not trade, it is totalitarianism. The great issue of our time is the loss of self-government by peoples all over the world, and the assumption by executive authority of the power to decide what is good for the people. That is the issue of our time. I say it is no answer to declare that we have a great and good President. It is no answer to say that the War Department will be there, that the State Department will be there, that the Department of Commerce will be there, and that other executive departments and bureaus will be there. What I am pointing out is that the elected

representatives of the people will not be there. That is what we are dealing with.

If ever there was a time when the elected spokesmen of the people of the United States should not surrender their power, this is the time. We stand upon the threshold of events which no man can foretell. There is no member of the Committee on Finance, there is no Member of the Senate, and no Member of the House, no official of the executive branch of the Government anywhere, who can predict the conditions which will exist in this world 1 year from today, to say nothing of conditions 3 years from today.

We know that the great Government of Britain, through some of its leading spokesmen, is advocating the reestablishment of the cartel system. We know that Russia is a state-managed economy. We know that Argentina is a state-managed economy. We know that Spain is a dictatorship. Wherever one's eye turns in the world today he finds systems of government which are not founded upon the theory on which our Government is founded, which is that the people control.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. Do not all the countries to which the Senator has referred desire to trade in the best market in the world?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course they wish to trade in the best market in the world, and I believe, I will say to the Senator from Georgia, that the representatives of the best customers in the world should know what sort of a deal is going to be made for them.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator answer another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator concedes that they wish to trade here, in the best market there is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think they do.

Mr. GEORGE. Should we not be able to talk with them about the conditions under which they will trade?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. GEORGE. And the concessions they will make to us?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. I agree that we should talk with them, certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator's only objection is that he thinks they should talk with the Congress, and not the Executive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all. The Senator has always misapprehended my argument, I am sorry to say. He has been very kind in listening to me, but I have never been able to convey to him the principle which I have had in mind during all these 12 years when I have consistently suggested that before a trade agreement should become effective it should be laid upon the desks of the Members of the Senate and of the House.

Let the State Department carry on its conversations, certainly, let the War Department and the Navy Department sit in and advise, let the Department of Commerce advise, of course, let all that be done, but before the contract is signed, sealed, and delivered, let us know what is in it so that the Senator from Georgia may say to the people of Georgia,

before the contract becomes binding. "This is what will happen to the articles in which you trade"; so that the Senator from Louisiana may know and report to his constituents what is being done with the commodities in which his State is interested; so that the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from North Dakota—every Senator in this body—shall be in a position, before the bargaining power of his people has been granted away, to report to them and say, "Surely we are making trade agreements, but I know what is transpiring."

Mr. President, I remember that several years ago, after the Trade Agreements Act was first passed, the Committee on Information was holding a hearing in one of the Government buildings with respect to a trade agreement with a foreign country—I have forgotten which country—and, together with many other Senators and Representatives, I attended the hearing because among the items which were in the published notice were commodities in which the people of my State were interested. As I stood there before the rostrum on which were seated half a dozen persons whom I had never seen before, whose names I did not know, who had never been elected by the people of any State, I saw Senators stand before those gentlemen and say to them, "These are the commodities produced in my State. Do not give them away."

I turned on my heel and I walked out, because to me it was a humiliating spectacle to see Members of the Senate and of the House, who have the constitutional power to fix tariff rates, pleading before appointive officers for the protection of the industries and the commerce of their States, and pleading, Mr. President, not to the Secretary of State, not to the President, not to the Tariff Commission, not to the experts who were going to write the agreements, but to subordinate officials who were merely sitting there listening and who had no power whatsoever. The power was ours, given to us by the Constitution of the United States. We had delegated it away upon the plea that the great depression of 1929 had brought about such a condition that in self-protection it was necessary for us to give this power away to the State Department, and let the Department save us, because we could not save ourselves.

That, Mr. President, was 10 or 12 years ago. Nothing was done. Trade agreements were made. They were ineffective. They brought no results. The explanation is now given, and properly, that they could not have been expected to have brought results because the whole world was rushing toward war. That is true. But what are we rushing toward now? Who knows? Shall we put blinders on? Shall we whom the Constitution designates as the lawmakers, whom our people have sent here to make the laws—shall we now put the blinders on, close our eyes, convey our responsibility, our duty, and our power to unnamed individuals, who, in our name, will do we know not what; who will sign the names of our constituents to this contract of which we know nothing?

Mr. President, I was talking to a Senator this afternoon about this matter. The thought came into my mind: A function cannot be preserved by refusing to exercise it. Functions which we do not use atrophy and die. Senators and Representatives wonder at the absenteeism in the Senate and in the House which is noted in the press. Why should we wonder about it? Do we not know why it is? Why are Senators and Representatives absent? They are absent because we have given away our power. That is why they are absent. They do not sit here idly merely to talk while somebody else exercises the power which the Constitution gave to us.

Mr. President, I shall have more to say about this subject before the debate is concluded, but I say now, if ever there was a time when the spokesmen of free government should assert themselves it is this moment.

Oh, it is said, "You would go back to the logrolling days of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill." That does not follow, Mr. President. But suppose it were true; all in the world those who take that position are saying is that the fixing of tariffs in a free assembly is a function of government of which they want no more. They are saying when they vote to delegate unreviewable power to the Executive, "We are through with legislative government so far as this issue is concerned, and we are adopting executive government."

Mr. President, what has happened is that we are moving away from the free enterprise of which everyone talks so glibly and so eloquently. We are moving away from the free enterprise of free individuals into a managed economy. We have had a managed economy during the war. We had to have a managed economy because we were fighting totalitarian powers and we had to go totalitarian ourselves. We did go totalitarian because it was necessary for us to put into the hands of some group the power to mobilize all the manpower and all the material power, all the resources, human and natural, available in the United States. So we created the OPA and the War Production Board, and so we created all the other agencies which by fiat from Washington told us what to do. We willingly did it because we knew it was necessary in order to win the war.

Are we going to do it in the reconversion period? Ah, Mr. President, if we do, then be certain that we are turning our backs upon free government, and we are adopting the theory of the managed state.

I attended meetings of the Finance Committee when it was considering this bill. I was there while Assistant Secretary of State Clayton was testifying, and the committee was gracious enough to permit me to ask a question or two of Mr. Clayton. I asked him how much the foreign trade amounted to. He said, "Six or seven percent of our total trade."

Assume, Mr. President, it amounts to 10 percent. Is 10 percent of our trade worth the sacrifice of the constitutional power of the Congress to say what shall be done about tax rates, about tariff rates, about international trade agreements? I do not believe so. I do not

believe that all the trade in the world is worth the sacrifice of the principles of free government, because, Mr. President, I say that here, the last upon the surface of the earth, stands a great free government. In order to prosecute the war we willingly cooperated with everything we possessed. We even contributed 1,000,000 casualties to the winning of the European war. The war in Europe is over, but we are not yet at peace, and we will have to make more sacrifices. Enormous sacrifices have been made by the young men of America in order to preserve free government, and the Congress of the United States cannot serve them by giving it away and establishing executive government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If I correctly understand the Senator's argument, a comparable argument could be made by referring to the question of income taxes and the delegation to appointive officials of the power arbitrarily to regulate from time to time, according to their own whims, the amount and rates of income taxes the people should pay. Am I correct that that is a proper analogy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is completely proper. All we would have to do would be to say, "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, the constitutional law-making bodies of the United States, that hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury may increase or decrease income-tax rates by 50 percent of what they were on a certain date, or 50 percent of what they are now."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am surprised that the Senator from Wyoming accepts that as a complete analogy. He certainly must know that in dealing with foreign nations the executive branch, and the executive branch alone, can function. The legislative branch cannot function. It cannot enter into trade agreements. At best, it can delegate the authority to the executive branch, which since Marshall's day has been recognized as the sole agency through which negotiations with foreign governments can take place.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, but that does not destroy the pertinency of my answer.

Mr. GEORGE. There is no analogy between negotiating with Argentina, Brazil, or France for a concession in return for which we are willing to make a concession—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia switches from the treaty-making power to the tax-collecting power, and from the tax-collecting power to the treaty-making power.

Mr. GEORGE. No. The Senator said that the analogy was complete. I hardly think the Senator wants the RECORD to stand that way. There is no analogy at all, because there can be no negotiations respecting a trade agreement with any foreign nation, whether

they involve a duty, a quota, or anything else, unless such negotiations are conducted by the President of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not talking about negotiations.

Mr. GEORGE. So there can be no analogy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. That would not be similar to making laws with respect to the levying of an income tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I say, the Senator chooses—and very properly as an argument—to hop from the subject of levying taxes to the subject of negotiating. Of course, the President has the power to negotiate; of course, foreign relations are in the hands of the Executive; but under the constitutional system, when the President negotiates a treaty with a foreign government, he submits it to the Senate, where it must be ratified before it becomes effective.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. If that is the Senator's position, I can understand that it ought to be submitted to the Senate. If that were done we might as well destroy the act. We could never get any action here. It would require 30 months—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is saying that if we proceed in the constitutional way we may as well destroy the act.

Mr. GEORGE. No; if the Senator will pardon me, the way provided in the act is the constitutional one. This is exactly the way we have proceeded to make freight and passenger rates. There are some things which the Congress cannot do. In this instance we are lodging the power in the President, with all manner of safeguards thrown around it, to negotiate trade treaties, because we do not wish merely to reduce a rate or lift a restriction unless we can get something in return.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I disagree with the Senator from Georgia in that statement. I have always contended before the Committee on Finance, and I now contend, that there is no comparison between the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the delegation to the President, through the State Department, of the power to make trade agreements and fix tariff rates. The distinction between the State Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, was clearly portrayed upon the floor of this body when the reorganization bill was under consideration several years ago. The proposal which came to us from the Executive at that time was that in the reorganization plan the Interstate Commerce Commission should be placed under the power of the President. The Congress refused to do so; the Congress said, "The Interstate Commerce Commission is a quasi judicial body acting in the place of Congress, and we refuse to place it under the power of the President." We did not place it under the power of the President. In this case, however we may look at it, whether we are considering the levying of a tax or the formulation of an international

agreement, we are placing a clearly legislative function in the hands of the President. We are placing the whole transaction, from the negotiation to the completion, signing, and delivery of the agreement, in the hands of the Executive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator seriously contend that if we were to follow his suggestion there would be anything at all done?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I think it is quite possible. I think that throughout this war the Congress of the United States has demonstrated its capacity to rise to whatever heights were necessary in order to convey the necessary power—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For the purpose of winning the war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To carry on the war and win it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator mentioned the OPA, in connection with carrying on the war. In carrying on the peace, consider the record of the Senate and the other legislative body after the last war. Have they ever demonstrated the facility or the organization to deal with matters of this kind?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that the organization could be improved. For example, with respect to this precise matter, I believe that it would be a very desirable improvement if some members of the Senate Finance Committee and some members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House were designated to sit with the Executive in drafting trade treaties, or at least in fixing the rates—in exercising the legislative function. Certainly the machinery could be improved. All I am protesting against is the sacrifice, without reservation, of the congressional power.

A moment ago a Senator handed me the Senate Manual, opened at the place where the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 8, recites the powers of the Congress. It reads:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—

Again:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

Let us not fool ourselves. What we are doing by this bill is rewriting the Constitution. We are saying that the Executive shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, and power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. That is precisely why I say that we are living in a world in which the executive power, the state-managed economy, has risen to heights which threaten the existence of free government; and I protest against this surrender by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under our system of division of power, the proposal seems to me to be perfectly constitutional. It was contemplated that the general pol-

icy should be established by the Congress, and that its execution should be delegated to the Executive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No one can tell me what the policy is under the Reciprocal Trade Act. There is power under the act to raise duties or lower them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The policy, obviously, is to try to lower them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator says "obviously."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator have any doubt that that is the policy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The power is granted to raise duties as well as to lower them. The complete power of Congress is granted to the President. All in the world that the Senator from Arkansas is saying is this: "The democratic system that we have is cumbersome. It is difficult to operate. The modern world has outrun it, and we must surrender our powers to the Executive." Mr. President, if I felt that way, I would pack up my bag and go home.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say a moment ago that, insofar as trade agreements are concerned, he would rather see them destroyed, even though it cost us all our foreign trade?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all; I did not say that. I said I do not believe the foreign trade is worth the sacrifice of the American system of government, under which the people of Illinois elected the distinguished Senator last year to come to Washington, and, as a Member of the Senate, to represent them and their interests on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That does not have very much to do with what I asked the Senator. I thought he said that there was not enough foreign commerce in the world to be of sufficient importance to justify the making of such trade agreements. It seemed to me that the practical effect of what the Senator said was that all the foreign commerce with which we could deal would not be of sufficient importance to warrant having trade agreements go into effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President; the Senator misunderstood me. I repeat what I said: I said that all the foreign trade in the world is not worth the sacrifice of the American system of government.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; the Senator is taking the position that through trade agreements we are sacrificing our constitutional rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, indeed, Mr. President; again I say that the Senator from Illinois has not followed my argument. My whole theory is this—

Mr. LUCAS. Well, the Senator—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall tell him what I am trying to do, and then he can argue with me and can prove that I am wrong, if he is able to do so. I am saying to him that, of course, the State Department and the President should carry on negotiations with foreign countries. Of course, we should endeavor to bring about a better trade relationship throughout the world.

Of course, we should do everything within our power to upbuild the foreign trade of the United States. But when the State Department has negotiated trade agreements, I say we should let the State Department file them with the Congress, before they become effective, and the Congress should look at them.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know that that was done in connection with the provision in the McKinley Tariff Act? Of the 17 agreements which the President sent to the Congress and which were referred to the committee, all were pigeonholed. None ever got before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, that occurred during a Republican administration. I will say to the Senator that in the present administration I would not expect that to be done.

Mr. LUCAS. That was a Republican administration, it is true, but that is not the answer. As I understand the situation, in all our history very few trade treaties or agreements which have been sent to the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval by means of concurrent action have ever been approved. The Senator from Wyoming has adopted the method he is now employing in an attempt to destroy trade treaties, because it is as certain as I am standing here that if every trade agreement which is proposed to be made between this country and any other country has to come back to the Senate, the old logrolling system will be revived. As the Senator said a while ago, the Senator from Rhode Island would ascertain whether some product of his State was affected; the Senator from Illinois would ascertain whether some product of his State was affected; and the Senators and Representatives from all the 48 States of the Union would seek to tack onto an agreement amendments, and thus the old logrolling system would be renewed. As you said in the committee the other day, the system of "You scratch my back and I will scratch yours" would be revived. That was the old system. If we adopt it again, when we get through there will be nothing left to which any other nation will agree. That is the truth of the matter. In that case, the trade agreements would be gone. We might just as well advocate the outright repeal of the law, and provide for a return to the old tariff system. That is the situation in a nutshell. We must take either one horn of the dilemma or the other.

I am sorry I misunderstood the Senator a while ago, but I thought I distinctly understood him to say that there was not enough trade in the world that would satisfy—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator can read my remarks in the Record, and I assure him they will not be changed.

Mr. LUCAS. I was about to say that I hope the Senator will not change them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not have that habit.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish to see our country again become isolationist. However, that is what we are headed for unless the power to make trade agreements is continued.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer today, but I merely wish to point out that a great deal of water has gone over the dam since William McKinley was President of the United States. Since then there has been a great deal of progress. I even think there has been a great deal of progress in the Senate and the House of Representatives. I believe that those who are elected in our time to the Senate and the House of Representatives will discharge their functions in an effective and patriotic manner. I think no danger will ensue from retaining our constitutional power. But, Mr. President, regardless of that fact, it is perfectly clear to everyone who cares to consider the situation that every argument which has been advanced here this afternoon—and, I prophesy, every argument which will be advanced throughout this debate—to sustain the plea that Congress should surrender its power is an argument against legislative government.

I say that at a time when authoritarian government is springing up all over the world, the Congress of the United States of America should not be the one to adopt even one tittle of it in this country in respect to any legislative matter. What we should undertake to do from now is to regain as much of the legislative power as it is possible for us to recapture.

Mr. President, the people of the United States expect Congress to regain the powers it has relinquished. We cannot satisfy their desires by continuing to give away our powers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize the lateness of the hour, but I cannot resist the temptation to comment on one or two of the statements made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming. He has adverted to what he calls and to what has become known as absenteeism in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and he attributes that to the fact, as he has said, that the Congress has surrendered all of its power, and that there is no need for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to remain here, because they have no power left to exercise. I disagree with the Senator about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not recall having said that we have surrendered all our power, although, of course, we have come rather close to doing that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President, the Senator said that we have surrendered so much of it that no Senator has any interest in remaining here. I disagree with that statement. Deplorable as chronic absenteeism is, yet I realize that Senators frequently have to be absent. I also realize that during the war and in recent weeks there has been a special condition which has induced many Members of the Senate to go abroad. I think that in the main their trips have been helpful.

Let me say that if the Senate were now considering the details of a tariff bill I doubt very seriously whether we would

have any greater ease in maintaining the presence of a quorum than we now have. I went through the debates on the Tariff Act of 1930. As the Senator from Georgia has said, they began in 1928 and concluded on the 30th of June 1930. The bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives, and interminable hearings were held. The bill was debated in the Senate for many months. I was the ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee of the Finance Committee on Metals and Metal Products. My recollection is that we then had about as hard a time keeping Senators here in the exercise of their power to levy taxes as we now have. There was not much difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one point about which I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Wyoming, and I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky to comment upon it in connection with the proposed program. Does not the Senator from Kentucky believe that the proposal would have considerable effect in the minds of the peoples of other nations with respect to our intentions in the political and international field? We cannot isolate trade treaties so that we can take one position with regard to them on one day, and on the next day take an inconsistent position in the political field. I think the matter is very important.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator has stated is no doubt true. Our attitude toward other nations, and our willingness to cooperate with them and bring about a program designed to increase the interchange of goods, thereby affording greater employment in all countries, has an indispensable relationship to our political cooperation.

As the Senator from Georgia pointed out a while ago, neither in international trade nor in domestic trade can we separate the economic situation from the political.

The Senator from Wyoming said a moment ago, or at least intimated, that it is humiliating for Members of Congress, especially Members of the Senate, to go to the executive departments with respect to taxes. The Constitution gives Congress the power to levy taxes. However, instead of levying them ourselves, we go to some subordinate to whom we have surrendered power. The Constitution gives to the Members of the Senate the right to confirm or reject Presidential appointments. The Constitution provides that the President shall, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint persons to office. We, as Members of the Senate, do not feel that we are acting beneath the dignity of a Senator when we go to an executive officer and ask him to appoint a friend of ours. There is no lack of dignity connected with that.

The same Constitution which says that Congress shall levy and collect taxes, in almost the next sentence it says that it shall regulate commerce, not only with foreign nations, but with Indian tribes, and among the various States. The

Constitution gives Congress the authority to levy and collect taxes, and to regulate commerce among the States, with foreign nations, and with Indian tribes. Yet for more than half a century there has been in existence the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was established for the purpose of regulating commerce. Congress surrendered its power to examine into the details of such regulation by establishing the Commission. From time to time various Members of Congress, including myself, have appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of arguing with regard to a rate structure which they felt injured their respective sections, or some other particular section of the country. I do not think that by so doing they were acting beneath their dignity as United States Senators.

Mr. President, if Congress could establish the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of regulating commerce among the States, as it did more than half a century ago, under the same sentence, the same article, and the same section of the Constitution it could establish a commission to regulate commerce with foreign nations. We have not done that as yet, except in part, then we established the Tariff Commission and gave it power to change rates. If Congress has the power to set up an independent agency it has the power to create or to clothe an already existing agency with power. That is what we are doing in this case with the President of the United States. We are making him our agent for the purpose of regulating commerce between the United States and other nations through the medium of trade agreements.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator give any weight to the theory of the division of powers set forth in the Constitution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator not see a difference between the establishment of a quasi-judicial commission, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, and a delegation of power to an executive arm of the Government which was established under the Constitution to carry out the law?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not see any distinction between the establishment of an independent commission by Congress to exercise a constitutional authority, and an authorization by the Congress to the President to act as its agent to exercise the same function. We have granted similar authorizations recently. The pending measure provides nothing new. We are authorized under the Constitution to raise an army, but we do not stand on the street corners and solicit enlistments. We authorize the President and the Secretary of War to do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator realizes that Congress may pass a law, as in this war it passed the Selective Service Act, in which it carefully prescribed the power of the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and in the pending measure we are proposing to prescribe the power of the President. That is, he may reduce tariffs 50 percent. I am in favor of a division of power, but not a divorce between the executive and the legislative. They must work together. I think we do not violate the Constitution, either in its letter or in its spirit, by authorizing the President to act as an agent of Congress. It was done as far as back 1791, even during the administration of George Washington. Why argue about the constitutionality of it now?

I do not want to go on ad libitum at this late hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has been a Member of the Senate for a long while. Is it his view that if we adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming actually there will be no trade agreements? Is it not true that in that event we might just as well not pass the pending bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my view of it. I participated in the debate on the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, and I remember that on one occasion when we were discussing the logrolling which everyone knew was taking place, a distinguished Senator announced on the floor of the Senate that he was a logroller as well as a back scratcher, that he would scratch anybody's back who would scratch his, and he further announced that his back was itching at that very moment, and he wanted anyone to scratch it who was willing to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I did not rise to make a speech. I wish to have printed in the RECORD some figures for the information of the Senate so that Members may be perusing them during the debate.

On January 1, 1939, we made an agreement with the United Kingdom dealing with woolen manufactures, and I should like to show what the deleterious, injurious, and destructive effects of it may have been.

In 1939 the value of all our domestic production was \$306,000,000 plus. In that year imports were 1.4 percent of production. In 1937 the value of our domestic production was \$540,000,000 plus, and imports were 1.9 percent. That was before the agreement to which I have referred was entered into.

In 1939, after having operated a full year under the agreement, our domestic production was \$476,000,000-plus, and imports were 2 percent, or one-tenth of 1 percent more than they were the preceding year.

We made agreements with Switzerland and with France. The Swiss agreement was effective on February 15, 1936, and the agreement with France was effective on June 15, 1936.

In 1937 our domestic production was \$834,000,000-plus, and our importations were 1.4 percent of our production.

In 1937 our domestic production was valued at \$1,238,000,000-plus, and importations were 2.3 percent.

In 1939 our domestic production was valued at \$1,012,000,000 and our imports at 1.8 percent.

We made an agreement with Canada on cattle and beef effective January 1, 1936, and with Argentina effective November 15, 1941. That was after the years which I am discussing.

In 1933 our domestic production of cattle and beef amounted to \$7,331,000,000 pounds, and importations were 1.6 percent.

In 1935 we produced 7,565,000,000 pounds, and our importations amounted to 4.1 percent. That was before any trade agreement had been made either with Canada or Argentina.

In 1937, the next year after the trade agreement was made, we produced 7,906,000,000 pounds, and our imports were 4.8 percent.

In 1939 we produced 8,000,000,000 pounds plus, and importations were 5.5 percent.

With respect to farm income from cattle and calves, in 1933 such income was \$599,000,000, in 1935 \$1,062,000,000, in 1937 \$1,238,000,000, and in 1939 \$1,289,000,000.

Mr. President, I have some figures here with respect to leather footwear, under

an agreement with Czechoslovakia made in 1938, which because of conditions in Europe, continued in effect only to April 22, 1939.

I have here also a table with reference to elastic fabrics, under an agreement with France.

I have a table in regard to pottery, under a trade agreement made with the United Kingdom.

I also have a table as to watches and clocks, under an agreement made with Switzerland effective February 15, 1936.

I also have a table with reference to cheddar cheese, under an agreement made with Canada effective January 1, 1936.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD at this point, showing the domestic production and the percentage of imports of all these items contained in the tables, so that they may be studied by Members of the Senate during the debate, and prior to final action on the bill.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Domestic production and imports of selected commodities, showing percentages imports are of domestic production, 1933-39

Product and agreement in which principal concession was made	1933	1935	1937	1939
Woolen manufactures (United Kingdom, effective Jan. 1, 1939):				
Domestic production.....	\$306,281,000	(1)	\$540,919,000	\$476,787,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.4	(1)	1.9	2.0
Cotton manufactures (Switzerland, effective Feb. 15, 1936, and France, effective June 15, 1936):				
Domestic production.....	\$834,207,000	(1)	\$1,238,909,000	\$1,612,147,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.4	(1)	2.3	1.8
Cattle and beef (Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936 on cattle):				
Argentina, effective Nov. 15, 1941, on canned beef):				
Domestic production (pounds).....	7,331,000,000	7,565,000,000	7,906,000,000	8,002,000,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.6	4.1	4.8	5.5
Cash farm income from cattle and calves, beef and veal.....	\$599,485,000	\$1,062,426,000	\$1,238,924,000	\$1,289,658,000
Leather footwear (Czechoslovakia, effective Apr. 16, 1938, to Apr. 22, 1939):				
Domestic production (pairs).....	350,400,000	383,800,000	412,000,000	424,100,000
Imports as percent of production.....	0.6	0.4	1.1	0.6
Elastic fabrics (France, effective June 15, 1936):				
Domestic production.....	\$16,130,000	\$15,237,000	\$14,924,000	\$16,065,000
Imports as percent of production.....	1.3	1.1	1.7	1.2
Pottery (United Kingdom, effective Jan. 1, 1939):				
Domestic production.....	\$44,024,000	(1)	\$97,365,000	\$97,861,000
Imports as percent of production.....	12.4	(1)	10.2	6.9
Watches and clocks and movements (Switzerland, effective Feb. 15, 1936):				
Domestic production.....	\$29,201,000	\$62,549,000	\$104,446,000	\$89,513,000
Imports as percent of production.....	6.7	8.8	10.3	11.3
Cheddar cheese (Canada, effective Jan. 1, 1936):				
Domestic production (pounds).....	415,649,000	475,788,000	497,007,000	541,781,000
Imports as percent of production.....	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.2
Income of domestic Cheddar cheese producers.....	\$42,396,000	\$68,638,000	\$79,024,000	\$69,348,000

¹Not available.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement, made necessary by the fact that a very strained and, in my opinion, illogical construction is put on the rules of the Senate requiring the attendance of Senators in person in the Senate Chamber at the time of a roll call.

I was present in the Chamber this morning, and I have been present this afternoon a part of the time, and a part of the time I have been in my office and elsewhere about the Capitol and the Senate Office Building; but now the only way I can get my name in the RECORD so as to show I was present this afternoon is by taking one of two methods, between which I can choose. One is to

suggest the absence of a quorum, which would show that there are only eight Senators present, and would show that all the others are absent individually. The other is to make a statement, which will get my name in the RECORD, and show that I was here.

It seems to me that if a Senator is present anywhere in the Capitol Building or the Senate Office Building, and lets the clerk know he is there and ready to come and vote on any matter which calls for a vote in the Senate Chamber, that should be taken by the clerk as evidence of his attendance. It is absurd to suppose that when a Senator is in the lobby, or the restaurant, or the cloak room, or in his own office or a committee room, and communicates with the clerk, that

should not be regarded as indicating that he is present. That was, until a short time ago, the rule, but for some reason, owing to an individual Senator's remonstrance, the rule has been, in effect, changed. So the only recourse a Senator has is to choose between suggesting the absence of a quorum and demanding a roll call or taking the floor and interrupting the proceedings to make a statement, as I am now doing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair will certify that the Senator from Rhode Island has been in the Senate a number of times today, and was really present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, with regard to the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, I think we all agree that the enforcement of any rule of the Senate necessarily works a hardship on someone. Yet I cannot quite agree that we should adopt the rule that a Senator could telephone from his office and say he is present, or will be here, if there is a roll call vote on some proposition, because if all Senators should do that, we would have more empty benches than we have now, or usually have.

I can appreciate the frequent difficulty and embarrassment of Senators who are present most of the time, and who happen to be out of the Chamber when a roll call for quorum purposes is brought about, which emphasizes another ridiculous rule of the Senate, it seems to me. All 96 Senators may be in their seats in the Senate at any given time, but if any Senator makes a point of no quorum the clerk must call the roll to see if they are here. I think there should be a rule that the Chair could count Senators present to see whether there is a quorum, instead of the necessity of having the roll called, even though the Senate Chamber is filled. That is the rule in the House of Representatives, and it has worked well. The only object of calling the roll for a quorum is to get a quorum of 49 Senators present. If they are all here, it seems to me the Chair should be able to count them and see they are here, and announce that a quorum is present. I doubt whether the Senate would ever agree to a sensible rule like that, but that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to add another illustration to the one the able Senator, the majority leader, used. Suppose there is a roll call, and a Senator whose name begins with A answers present, and then leaves the Chamber. By the time the clerk gets down to the Z's, if there are any, there may not be a quorum present, because Senators are not all here at any one time, and it would be necessary to begin over again with the A's. That would be the logical construction of the rule, that all Senators must be present at one time.

NOTICE OF HEARING OF WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to give notice, so that it may appear in the RECORD, that a meeting has been called of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, to which all members of the Committee on Military Affairs are being in-

vited, and to which members of the Industrial Reorganization Committee of the Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning have been invited, to hear the members and staff of the Surplus Property Board, on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock. The meeting will be held in room 357 in the Senate Office Building.

The nomination of Mr. W. Stuart Symington, of St. Louis, to be a member of the Surplus Property Board, has been referred by the Committee on Military Affairs to the subcommittee. Mr. Symington will appear in the city sometime this week.

The purpose of the meeting will be to afford the members of the Surplus Property Board an opportunity to discuss with the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, from which came the Surplus Property Act, the principles which are guiding the disposal of property. Certain objectives were set forth in the act.

As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the summary of the progress report of the Surplus Property Board which has just been received in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD

Part I of the report contains largely historical material setting forth disposal experiences after World War I and the history of the Surplus Property Act.

Part II is entitled "Basic Organization and Problems." The following statements are important:

1. General supervision and direction authorized under section 6 of the act signifies both policy and control. So far the Board has been concerned primarily with the establishment of policy.

2. Many disposal transactions by owning agencies take place under statutes other than the Surplus Property Act.

3. For the purpose of achieving better coordination with other Government agencies the Surplus Property Board has established an Advisory Board of representatives of other agencies.

4. The revised Budget estimate of \$2,619,170 allows for a staff of 377 persons.

5. The staff is set up under an administrator. There are seven major offices: Industrial property, consumer goods, real estate, aviation, foreign disposals, reports and information, and staff services.

6. Surplus property in the hands of the owning and disposal agencies amounted to almost \$1,400,000,000 in terms of procurement cost. The backlog of undisposed surplus amounted to almost \$1,000,000,000, representing largely aircraft and related equipment.

7. Approximately 16 percent of available surpluses, or approximately \$265,000,000 worth in terms of procurement cost, were disposed of during the 10-month period between June 1944 and March 1945. The fastest moving stocks consist of food, next consumer goods, next small vessels.

8. Four-fifths of sales are made to non-governmental buyers, about 12 percent to Federal agencies. Only about 2 percent are taken by State and local governments.

Part III, entitled "Putting the Act Into Effect," deals primarily with the several provisions for priorities and preferences:

1. Transfers within the War and Navy Departments and between the two departments amounted to \$212,000,000.

2. State and local governments are not given priority on all items but only a selected list of items.

3. Veterans' preference is being effected through the medium of Smaller War Plants Corporation, which will acquire surpluses which veterans have requested and turn those items over to individual veterans on credit terms.

4. Distribution in rural areas is covered by Surplus Property Board Regulation No. 3, which provides for channeling into such areas surplus property having farm use. This is done with the cooperation of the War Foods Administrator and the Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

5. Small business preference is effected by selling in small lots. More than 85 percent of all transactions executed by the Treasury Department were under \$1,000, and 68 percent under \$500.

6. Plant disposal will have greater impact upon the long-run structure of the economy than will the disposal of any other class of surplus. Roughly one-fifth of the Nation's industrial capacity, representing an investment of \$16,000,000,000, is now owned by the Government. Plant disposal must be approached both on an industry-wide and national basis. Industry reports are under preparation. The present surplus of plants is small—amounting to 46—representing a total cost of \$102,000,000. Thirty-one additional plants are excess, representing a value of about \$444,000,000, but have not been declared surplus.

7. Contractor inventories present a special problem because they are widely scattered and speedy plant clearance is important. The retention of plant equipment by contractors is being encouraged except for plant equipment short in supply.

8. Disposal of real property has not been a task of great magnitude since only 139,000 acres out of a total of 9,000,000 acres and 26,000 parcels have been declared surplus.

The remainder of the chapter deals with the description of the provisions made for distributing information, and establishing procedures for investigations and checks of surplus transactions.

Part IV entitled "Principal Disposal Programs" goes into further details with respect to activities under each of the disposal programs for aircraft, capital and producers' goods, consumers' goods, agricultural commodities and food, ships and maritime policy, and foreign disposal.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12 (legislative day of June 4), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be assistant dental surgeon, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Elbert W. King

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign

Everett A. Malcolm

To be ensign

Hartsel F. McCue

IN THE MARINE CORPS

FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be brigadier generals

Ray A. Robinson

William C. James

William O. Brice

POSTMASTERS

NEBRASKA

Enid M. Morgan, Rosalie.

NEW YORK

Edward J. Blackall, Fort Edward.

OHIO

Elsie O. Welty, West Mansfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

John T. Friend, Acosta.

John H. McKee, Corsica.

Eva E. Taft, East Springfield.

Elma V. Ross, Eau Claire.

Blanche A. E. Hemperly, Enhaut.

LeRoy E. Strawbridge, Felton.

Conrad A. Zahner, Glenfield.

Melvin J. Hurd, La Jose.

Frank W. Kebe, Moon Run.

Roy B. Leshner, Mount Pleasant Mills.

Elizabeth V. Heaps, North Bend.

William C. Stauffer, Orefield.

Mildred A. Swanson, Pittsfield.

Virginia R. Nosik, Pulaski.

William M. Stewart, Rochester Mills.

La Roy C. Best, Schnecksville.

Martha M. Benninger, Stiles.

Neil Kunselman, Tionesta.

Earl E. Koch, Wescosville.

John B. Myers, Wormleysburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Merciful God and Father of us all, again as children of Thy providence we approach Thee in humble confidence and with the courage of compelling faith. As we move through the hours of this day, breathe into us an atmosphere of brotherly love and consideration, subduing anxious striving. By the manifestation of the truth, walking in honor and personal integrity, may we commend ourselves to the favor of all men. O keep the Congress strong of heart, ready of mind, and consecrated in spirit as it administers the trust reposed in it as a priceless heritage of human freedom.

Grant, O Lord, that the great brotherhood of nations at last may learn the abiding source of their peace and happiness; that they may go forward and rise to new heights of greatness as they show forth the love that blesses those who give and those who receive. We pray Thee to create within us a passion to contend against whatever worketh wrong between man and man, nation and nation. Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice (Federal Bureau of Investigation).
4. Department of Labor.
5. Post Office Department.
6. National Housing Agency.
7. Office of Civilian Defense.
8. Office of Defense Transportation.
9. Office of War Information.
10. Selective Service System.

THE POLL TAX

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks under the rule he must recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] will be designated to control the time in opposition to the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gorski	Pace
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ala.	Ploeser
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ind.	Plumley
Bailey	Gwynne, Iowa	Price, Ill.
Barden	Hagen	Rabaut
Eates, Mass.	Hall	Rains
Bloom	Edwin Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Boren	Hancock	Richards
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Heffernan	Ryder
Carlson	Herter	Shafer
Case, N. J.	Hess	Sharp
Chapman	Hobbs	Sheppard
Clason	Hollifield	Short
Clements	Holmes, Wash.	Sikes
Coffee	Jarman	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Jennings	Slaughter
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Snyder
Curley	Johnson, Ind.	Stefan
Dirksen	Lyndon B.	Stewart
Dondero	Jones	Sundstrom
Doyle	Kean	Talbot
Durham	Kefauver	Thomas, N. J.
Earthman	Kilburn	Towe
Eaton	LaFollette	White
Fellows	Landis	Whitten
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Winter
	Mason	
	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE POLL TAX

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I first yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], to be yielded by him as he sees fit, and of my remaining 30 minutes I yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have been through many debates on the poll-tax situation, and always we are told that what each State does in reference to poll taxes is none of our business.